DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 359 081 SO 022 080

AUTHOR Barth, James L., Ed.
TITLE Citizenship as Social Studies Education. Bulletin 4.
INSTITUTION National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 92
NOTE 72p.; Papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Washington, DC, November 25, 1991). Prepared by the Foundations of the Social Studies Special Interest Group.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Collected Works - General (020)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship Education; Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; *Social Studies; United States History

ABSTRACT

This collection of seven papers focused on the topic citizenship as a part of social studies education. The titles of the papers are: "Old Glory, the Constitution, and Responsible Americanism: Elementary School Citizenship Education During World War II" (Sherry L. Field); "Shaping Model Citizens through Rituals of Good Manners: Examples from Guatemalan Elementary Schools" (Ronald W. Wilhelm); "'Your Mother Wears Army Shoes!' The Silly and Non-Productive Dispute between School History and the Social Studies" (O. L. Davis, Jr.); "Exploring Liberal-Democratic Dialogue in the Social Studies" (David Warren Saxe); "America 2000 Goal 3: A Reactionary Reform of Citizenship Education" (James L. Barth); "Social Studies: There Is a History, There Is a Body, but Is It Worth Saving?" (James L. Barth); and "The Contributions of Hilda Taba to Social Studies Education" (Jack R. Fraenkel). (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED359081

Citizenship as Social Studies Education

Bulletin 4

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

WALTER SCHULTZ

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Foundations of the Social Studies Special Interest Group

SO 023 080

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Citizenship as Social Studies Education

James L. Barth
O.L. Davis, Jr.
Sherry L. Field
Jack Fraenkel
David Warren Saxe
Ronald Wilhelm

Bulletin 4
January, 1992
Munster, IN

The Foundations of the Social Studies
Special Interest Group
A National Council for the Social Studies SIG

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD.....1

FSS SPONSORED PUBLICATIONS.....3

OLD GLORY, THE CONSTITUTION, AND RESPONSIBLE AMERICANISM:
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION DURING WORLD WAR II.....4

SHAPING MODEL CITIZENS THROUGH RITUALS OF GOOD MANNERS:
EXAMPLES FROM GUATEMALAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.....14

YOUR MOTHER WEARS ARMY SHOES! THE SILLY AND NON-PRODUCTIVE
DISPUTE BETWEEN SCHOOL HISTORY AND THE SOCIAL STUDIES.....18

EXPLORING LIBERAL-DEMOCRATIC DIALOGUE
IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES.....25

AMERICA 2000 GOAL 3: A REACTIONAL REFORM OF
CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION.....34

SOCIAL STUDIES: THERE IS A HISTORY,
THERE IS A BODY, BUT IS IT WORTH SAVING?.....43

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF HILDA TABA
TO SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION.....49

FOREWORD

The publication of these papers marks the Foundations of the Social Studies Special Interest Group's fourth bulletin. This bulletin deals with the theme, "Citizenship as Social Studies Education." The seven papers were presented at the National Council for the Social Studies Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C., November 25, 1991.

The Foundations of the Social Studies -- Special Interest Group (FSS) is an organization devoted to the study of the historical, philosophical, cultural, and sociological foundations of the social studies. Throughout its fourteen year history the goals of the FSS has been to publish the historical foundations of the social studies movement. The concern of many social studies educators which led to the creation of the FSS was that the foundations of the social studies, the very history and philosophy that provide a framework and rationale for the social studies were neither being preserved nor analyzed. The organization has been dedicated to publishing for posterity not just the historic documents but, also of equal importance, the analysis and criticism which is a necessary part of the development of any field of study.

Bulletin 4 is part of the FSS's continuing effort to provide fresh and interesting interpretations of the foundations of the social studies. The two lead articles are authored by two new, young, promising professors who have begun to tackle the difficult theme of citizenship education. Professor Field takes an interesting look at elementary school citizenship education during World War II. She examines how patriotism was accentuated during the period of war. The second article by Professor Wilhelm discusses the shaping of model citizens in Guatemalan elementary schools. Wilhelm observes that, "Teachers routinely transmit these expectations through class rules, through their daily interactions with their students, and through 'rituals of good manners'." Together the first two articles represent an excellent glimpse into how citizenship education is both an overt and covert activity in the classroom.

Professor O.L. Davis, a distinguished social studies educator, examines the 75 year dispute between school history and social studies. One way to interpret the dispute is to see it as an argument over how citizenship education should be taught in a K-12 curriculum. O.L. reviews the history of the dispute and concludes that it is time to settle the issue because it is no longer a productive issue.

Professor Saxe deals with citizenship education by "Exploring Liberal-Democratic Dialogue in the Social Studies." He takes the position that, "Social studies did not evolve from stagnation or some slow type of curricular decay over the past seventy years, but was manifest from the start in a series of intellectual battles over freedom in schools between those who wished to engage in democratic dialogue and those who sought to

suppress democratic dialogue." This is an interesting paper because it provides a unique context from which to view the first three papers in this bulletin. How was citizenship practiced in American classrooms during World War II, according to Field; what is happening in Guatemalan classrooms according to Wilhelm; and how might we view the dispute between school history and social studies, according to Davis? The speculation in Saxe's article offers an intriguing view of the conflicting positions on citizenship education.

The two articles by Professor Barth examine the contemporary clash between two education reform movements concerning citizenship education. Social studies was the first reform movement of citizenship education some 75 years ago. The newest effort at reforming social studies are initiatives from America 2000 Goal 3 as proposed by the Bush administration. The two articles should be, if possible, read as one. The first article explores the arguments for and against the National Council for the Social Studies cooperating with the America 2000 Goal 3 reform. The second article explores the attitudes of those reformers who have initiated the Goal 3 reform, ending with a suggestion that the field must identify basic beliefs, standards, and perhaps even a definition if it is to survive the challenge of the new reform initiative.

Professor Fraenkel continues the examination of citizenship education by noting the contributions of Hilda Taba. Taba was an influential pioneer in developing a social studies curriculum that stressed the skills necessary for an effective citizen. The curriculum materials she developed do provide a model that should persist into the 21st century. In truth, however, if America 2000 Goal 3 became national educational policy, then the approach suggested by Hilda Taba will not serve as a foundation for future citizenship education.

James L. Barth
Editor, FSS/SIG

Walter Schultz
Executive Director, FSS/SIG

FSS SPONSORED PUBLICATIONS

Over the past fourteen years FSS has either published or sponsored the publication of the following foundations of the social studies work. If you have an interest in the foundations and/or encourage the research of others in the field, you and your school library should have the following collection.

Bulletins published by FSS:

Identifying What Is Unique About the Social Studies, Bulletin 1. Eds. James L. Barth and Walter Schultz. (January 1989).

A Discipline of the Social Studies, Bulletin 2. Eds. James L. Barth and Walter Schultz. (February 1990).

FSS Bulletin 3. Eds. James L. Barth and Walter Schultz. (February, 1991).

Citizenship as Social Studies Education, Bulletin 4. Eds. James L. Barth and Walter Schultz. (January 1992).

Special editions of journals sponsored by FSS:

"The History of the Social Studies," Theory and Research in Social Education, 8, 3 (Fall 1980).

"Historical Foundations of Social Studies Education," Special issue ed. Virginia Atwood. Journal of Thought, 17, 3 (Fall 1982).

"Issues in Social Studies Education: A 50 Year Retrospective," edited by William Stanley, running throughout the 1985 issues of Social Education.

"Founders of the Social Studies," Special issue ed. James L. Barth. Indiana Social Studies Quarterly, XXXVIII, 3 (Winter 1985-86).

"Social Studies: Old Masters and Founders," Special issue ed. James L. Barth. The International Journal of Social Education, 3, 3 (Winter 1988-89).

"Social Studies as A Discipline," Special issue Ed. James L. Barth. The International Journal of Social Education, 6, 2 (Autumn 1991).

"Reforming the Social Studies," Special issue ed. James L. Barth. The International Journal of Social Education, 6, 4 (Spring 1992).

OLD GLORY, THE CONSTITUTION, AND RESPONSIBLE AMERICANISM: ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION DURING WORLD WAR II

Sherry L. Field
University of Colorado at Denver

War came to the United States following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. Soon afterwards, President Roosevelt expressed to the nation a "sense of indignation and horror" while reassuring citizens that, while initial news from the Pacific was tragic, they must not fall prey to rumors. Potentially sagging morales were shored up by Roosevelt's confidence-building words, "We are now in this war. Every single man, woman, and child is a partner in the most tremendous undertaking of our American history. We must share together the bad news and the good news, the defeats and the victories--the changing fortunes of war" (Southworth and Southworth, 1942, p. 216). The President quietly dispersed the clouds filling American citizens' minds The reality of the days was transparent. The preparations which had been made for the past two years by military planners, industrialists, workers, and educators were now to be implemented. The partnership which the President asserted began immediately.

THE FIRST WEEK

On Monday, December 8, schools across the nation opened to the sobering sense of wartime and military loss. Many teachers brought their radio sets to school that day in order that they and their pupils might listen to President Roosevelt's address to Congress. Radio use in school was uncommon at the time, and pupils immediately recognized that something very different was happening (Davis, 1991). In other schools, teachers and students did much more than listen to the radio.

For example, one Los Angeles junior high school with a mixed population, which included ten percent Japanese and five percent Italians, spent much of the entire first day of wartime in special activities (Woods, 1942). The principal called an assembly program Monday morning. After singing of "The Star Spangled Banner" and "America", the principal stressed the familial nature of the school. A vice principal and teacher spoke of trips abroad and of exemplary students from various ethnic and cultural backgrounds. The program concluded with students pledging allegiance to the flag. School attendance was normal that day. The principal had prepared for such an occurrence by establishing an active multicultural program in his school in which parents and teachers as well as students were involved. No animosity was reported to have been shown toward any student, including the Japanese-American students, on the war's "first day."

A similar report about the "first week" came from the staff

of Oak Lane Country Day School in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Shuey, Rang and others, 1942). Several additions to the social studies curriculum were quickly made to inform students and to allay their fears. Mead Ivins detailed activities of the ten and eleven-year old students. Globes were provided for each student, and more than an hour on Monday, December 8, was spent locating places in war news and of concern to students, including Philadelphia, the Hawaiian Islands, Guam, Wake, Midway, the Philippines, and Japan. Mileages between places were computed. Students listened to President Roosevelt's radio broadcast speech to Congress and the nation (p. 58). Mimeographed materials which had been prepared by teachers Sunday evening and Monday morning were distributed with the expressed aim that students and parents "be kept informed about the geography of the war zones and given some facts with which to work and reason" (pp. 53-54). On Tuesday and Wednesday, students read and discussed more about Japan from supplemental materials such as Readers Digest, Time, Philadelphia newspapers, and social studies textbooks. On Thursday, students determined additions to be made to the school newspaper, and then summarized current events of the week. By Friday, students discussed radio broadcasts; "all but two children listened to the 'March of Time' broadcast on Thursday night" (p. 58); many students shared daily newspaper articles; maps were used frequently whenever a discussion of the war occurred; and ten year-olds met daily with eleven, twelve and thirteen year olds to clarify questions arising from war events. Regular course work was not abandoned, but the war became an omnipresent curriculum reality.

Undoubtedly, schools across the nation reacted similarly to the beginning of war. Teachers realized the importance of allaying normal fears of their students and they eagerly accepted this responsibility. Almost immediately, school curriculum, activities, and daily routines reflected recognition of the necessity to expand school instruction. The nation's teachers recognized their role in the development of practical, intelligent curricular decisions targeted for the wartime education of the children of a country at war (Field, 1991).

CALLS TO ADVOCACY

Social studies education experienced unusual and increased attention and advocacy for practice during the crisis years of World War II. While several aspects of the elementary school curriculum remained ordinary and unchanged during the war years, other components, particularly those of citizenship education and geography, enjoyed heightened in textbooks and professional literature of the era.

Policy suggestions for wartime social studies quickly appeared. Especially significant to elementary social studies programs were three reports issued by the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), the major national professional organization of social studies educators. The Social Studies Mobilize for Victory and Wartime Social Studies in the Elementary

School appeared early in the war. The Social Studies Look Beyond the War. A Statement of Postwar Policy was issued in 1944. Of the three policy reports, Wartime Social Studies in the Elementary School was perhaps the most influential. Written by W. Linwood Chase, professor of education at Boston University, it provided substantive lesson plans including evaluative measures, suggestions for the teacher, and references which were missing from The Social Studies Mobilize for Victory and The Social Studies Look Beyond the War.

Chase's report seemed especially significant to elementary social studies teachers. First, information was specifically directed toward elementary school social studies education rather than general social studies education. Second, teachers received concrete, clear-cut descriptions and ready-to-use classroom units of study. Teachers were advised not to teach social studies "as usual" because, by doing so, important understandings about the war would be impossible to develop. Third, teachers received practical, age-appropriate guidelines to teach the story of the war. Finally, a comprehensive section, "War Duties for Young Children," identified numerous wartime tasks appropriate for elementary pupils and easily adaptable to individual school and community needs and opportunities.

In "War Duties for Young Children", Chase recognized the need for children to understand problems enlarged by war, such as the necessity to conserve war materials and accept substitutes willingly, to appreciate the huge financial costs of war and the consequent need to buy savings bonds and stamps, and to accept wartime rationing willingly and to understand its necessity. In addition to teaching about the economics of war as a patriotic duty, teachers were also urged to promote loyalty to the principles of democracy in various ways. Endorsing the emotional nature of patriotism, Chase advised social studies educators to make use of pageantry, flag salutes, pledges, rituals, the singing of the national anthem, patriotic music, dramatizations, exhibits, bulletin boards, posters, artistic creations, motion pictures, radio programs, assembly programs, stories of heroes, and slogans. He suggested possible titles for patriotic pageants, including "I Hear America Singing," "Our Heritage," "The Gifts of Our Ancestors," and 'Why I'm Glad I'm an America." A poem composed by the fifth grade class of teacher Elizabeth Perry, Driscoll School, Brookline, Massachusetts, intoned typical patriotic sentiments in its final verse,

> This war is for democracy
> The people's war,
> Where each must do his share--
> The men and women of the United Nations,
> The men and women of the invaded countries,
> The men and women on the battle fronts,
> The men and women in the factories,
> The boys and girls in school,
> All fight and work,
> To save our way of life,
> To save democracy (p. 19).

While activities such as this group composed poem were encouraged, Chase urged teachers to be mindful of preventing "outward manifestations from becoming substitutes for real devotion" (p. 18). Obviously, teachers should wholeheartedly promote the rituals of pageantry of patriotic symbols and stress a deeper meaning to young citizens. As well, children should be helped to articulate a personal meaning of democracy clearly and convincingly as part of their wartime patriotic duty.

Citizenship education in the prewar years and during the war period encompassed several major themes. These included promotion of character education, inculcation of patriotism and symbolic rituals, endorsement of community activities, understanding of democratic principles, focus on American heroes and historical figures, and participation in patriotic pageants. As Word War II progressed, school children were encouraged to participate in various citizenship-related activities and projects to benefit the war effort and to maintain a high morale on the homefront.

Interest in citizenship education for young Americans dramatically increased as documentation surfaced of life in a dictatorship and a totalitarian state in the early stages of European conflict and Japanese military expansion during the 1930s. Social studies educators were urged to expand classroom emphasis on citizenship. The Wartime Handbook of Education (1943) of the national Association exhorted:

> The democratic way life must be understood and appreciated by all citizens of a democracy. There should be in elementary and secondary schools study of dramatic, key episodes in the history of American democracy; biographies of men and women whose lives have advanced or personified the democratic tradition; great documents in American history; contrasts between democracy and dictatorship civil liberties; and the responsibilities and self-disciplines as well as the privileges of citizenship (p. 18).

A number of emphases were selected by elementary social studies educators to address "the call".

CLASSROOM ATTENTION TO CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Much attention was accorded the symbolic aspects of patriotism in citizenship behavior. For example, "Our Flag", an exemplary patriotic unit of study, was created by Sylvia Stark and Velma H. Omer (1943). Citing high interest created through their children's Victory campaign work as an impetus, the social studies teachers planned and implemented the patriotic unit. Several objectives were identified:

> To make better citizens of our youth and to instill the respect due our flag.

To present the history of our flag, the origin of Flag Day, and what stars, stripes and colors in the flag mean.
To know correct form in using and displaying the flag.
To learn more about how to respect our flag.
To learn the "Pledge of Allegiance" and the "American's Creed."
To learn our national and patriotic songs and what such means to a country (p.36).

A wide assortment of activities helped achieve the unit objectives, such as a field trip to an army camp to witness a flag ceremony and to a state historical museum to view different flags; a display of library books about the flag; and a collection of flags brought from home by pupils. Additionally, children were encouraged to make posters showing proper display of the flag; to write original poems and stories; to listen to stories about the flag; to learn various patriotic songs; and to make scrapbooks displaying their unit of work. Provided, too, were unit culminating activities which included a production of a patriotic pageant and a twenty-five item unit test, and two bibliographies for teachers and children.

During a period of classroom focus upon highly symbolic elements of citizenship education, much attention was afforded the flag salute and activities carried on by Stark and Omer (1943). The right of American citizens not to participate in the flag salute was decided by the Supreme Court in a landmark case, W. Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnett (1943). Even in a time of crisis in the United States, the civil rights of its citizens were upheld.

Patriotic plays and pageants regularly appeared in journals for elementary school teachers, and their number and sense of urgency increased as the war progressed. Dramatic presentations took a variety of themes, ranging from appreciation of the nation's forebears to support of the war effort by conservation and selling war stamps and bonds. One play, 'The Women of the Revolution" (Coffin, 1943), was particularly unusual for the time in its portrayal of women. Teacher Eleanor Fleming (1943) allowed her "Miss America" character to convey changing attitudes in the play "We Who Serve." "Miss America" opened the play with conviction, 'Only a few months ago, I was a symbol for peace and harmony. Now I stand for strength and preparedness." Then children symbolizing each letter spelled our LIBERTY with the prose,

L is for Liberty which our brave soldiers are fighting to preserve
I is for Independence now and forever.
B is for Bravery, never fear.
E is for Endurance which will lead us to Victory.
R is for Readiness, the Readiness to defend our nation.
T is for Truth which shall make us free.
Y is for Youth, the backbone of our nation (p. 39).

In turn, the words ARMY, MARINES, and AMERICA were also personified.

Another play intended to encourage patriotism and to "help children evaluate their own part in a total war" was "They Also Serve" by Alma Nelson Moscati (1943), a teacher in Public School No. 27, Jersey City, New Jersey. In this play, an assortment of flowers and insects conferred with "Mother Nature" about their part in the war effort. "Billy Bumblebee", for example, exclaimed, "The world is at war. Everyone should be working for his country but all we do is just sit and look pretty--or buzz around. It really doesn't seem sensible. We want to do something to help win the war" (p. 46). Eventually, the flower and insect characters in the play realized their contribution to the war effort was their spreading color and cheer on the home front. Another type of patriotic play contributed practical suggestions about ways to participate in Victory work at home. Children and their parents who viewed such plays as "A Soldier Hears From Home" by Pearl Laushel (1944), a second grade teacher at Goodrich School in Akron, Ohio, surely heard the message that their duty was wholeheartedly to participate in the war effort. The drama's action highlighted "Joe" and "Gary", soldiers who are reading a letter from Joe's family. Back home, Joe's family was "doing their bit" to help win the war campaign, such as going without meat and butter, working to buy war stamps and bonds, and collecting scrap.

Elementary social studies teachers found ways other than the production of plays to help their pupils learn lessons of good citizenship. Many teachers likely utilized methods such as having their children carefully copy wartime sentiments and information during "seatwork:time. Reproducible "seatwork" lessons regularly appeared in The Instructor, and often their themes were war-related or related to traits that make exemplary young citizens. For example, second grade teacher Josephine Bristol Beck (1943), at Barnum School, Birmingham, Michigan, provided "Seatwork on War Stamps." The lesson was divided into four segments for "Yes or No Answers," "Fill in the Blank Sentences," and "Circle Correct Words." Children were to answer "Yes" or "No" to statements such as:

We can buy War Stamps at school.
We buy as many War Stamps as we can.
There are some one-cent War Stamps.
Ten-cent War Stamps are brown.
It is patriotic to buy War Stamps.
We put War Stamps on letters (p.9).

In the "Circle Correct Words" segment, children were instructed to "draw a circle around the words that you could find in a War Stamp album," and they could choose from words such as airplane, stamp, defense, pond, lamp, milk, postal, bond, affix, savings, coastal, and value.

Primary Patriotic Seatwork", another example, was reported by Elsie Sprunk (1943), a teacher in the public school of Bayard,

New Mexico. For one segment, pupils studies the flag pictured, colored the flag, and crossed out the wrong numbers in the following statements:

> The flag has (7,10) red stripes.
> The flag has (4,6) white stripes.
> The flag has (48,50) stars (p.10).

Children also were to observe three soldiers pictured and "draw a line under the sentences that are right":

> The soldiers have on coats.
> The soldiers are running.
> The soldiers stand straight.
> Two soldiers have guns.
> The soldiers have hats (p.10).

Even though these sentiments use militaristic examples and are somewhat unsophisticated, teachers who required such activities certainly believed that they were contributing to the development of appropriately patriotic sentiments in their students.

One of the regularly-appearing features in American Childhood, "Lessons in Social Studies," focused on the concept of personal responsibility (Hanthorn, 1942). In one, a lesson for children to read aloud was provided with the text:

> Our country is at war.
> That means there is danger.
> We boys and girls are brave
> We can obey orders.
> We can look after ourselves.
> We know just what to do.
> And we will do it.
> Mother does not have to look after us.
> We will help little children, too.
> We can take responsibility (p.5).

Along with oral reading, teachers were encouraged to utilize discussion periods with suggested topics such as "I Play in Safe Places", "How I Care for My Little Sister", and "Soldiers Obey Orders." According to Hanthorn, "When a child has honestly mastered some selfish impulse and replaced it with an act of obedience, much has been accomplished toward real citizenship" (p.5).

Children's civic duty was conceived in various ways by educators. For example, principal Maud Frothingham Roby (1943) wrote, "Our responsibility lies largely in strengthening the home front" (p. 267). According to Roby, teachers should encourage their pupils to assume "their share of the responsibility in the home for the care of younger children, for household duties, and the running of errands" (p. 268). M. Flavia Taylor (1943), social studies teacher, Hamilton Junior High School, McKees Rocks, Pennsylvania, explained home responsibility. Primary

school children were to help with work at home to free their parents for wartime duties and were to be obedient in order that their parents and other adults could conduct their responsibilities efficiently. In Baltimore, teachers were advised by assistant superintendent Mary A. Adams (1942) to emphasize that "the people of Baltimore must adjust effectively to the changes resulting from the tremendous impact of the war program of this city" (p.14). For elementary pupils, this meant engaging in home and family duties. Children were to understand the increased work responsibilities of their parents and to help at home with arrangements for blackouts and safety. Similarly, J. Edward Bond (1942) stressed home safety and preparedness as part of pupils' civic responsibilities. New York University Center for Safety Education instructor, H. Louise Cottrell (1942), also emphasized several civilian defense duties of school children in a unit of study. Pupils were encouraged to oversee preparation of first aid kits for air raid shelters and learn blackout procedures for their homes. Cottrell provided checklists for home safety inspections as well as lists of foods which could be gathered for home use in time of emergency.

The social nature of civic and community education was promoted by Daisy Parton (1943), an education professor at the University of Alabama. She endorsed providing children with various work and group living experiences, such as "raising and caring for animals, cultivating flowers and vegetables, arranging and caring for the materials in the classroom, making and keeping the surroundings clean and attractive, collecting needed salvage, preparing and serving food, selling wanted articles, conserving materials and property, and caring for and helping younger children" (p. 162). Elementary school students were not to sit idly by in the uncertainties and pressures of wartime. They were to be, not simply to study about, "community helpers."

Patriotic activities which would encourage good citizenship and good character development were believed to be extremely important to the maintenance oh high civilian morale during the war years. Social studies teachers enjoyed an enthusiastic, supportive audience eager to aid the nation's fighting men. Lesson planning most likely included regular emphasis upon war themes, in small, daily activities such as flag rituals and singing patriotic songs, and in large, ambitious, projects such as salvage and scrap campaigns, war bond and war stamp sales, Victory gardens, and pageants. Important lessons, such as understanding life in a democracy and the interdependence of citizens in a democracy, were included in large units of study. Just as important, however, were seemingly insignificant rituals of learning patriotic songs, of doing patriotic seatwork, and of learning to work together in group projects.

Bibliography

Adams, M.A. (1942). Priorities in the social studies in the elementary schools. Baltimore Bulletin of Education, 20 (1), 3-16.

Beck, J.B. (1943). Seatwork on war stamps. The Instructor, 52 (3), 9.

Bond, J.E. (1942). Teaching home preparedness. The Instructor, 51 (9), 31.

Chase, W.L. (1943). Wartime social studies in the elementary school. Washington, D.C.: The National Council for the Social Studies

Coffin, O. (1943). The women of the revolution. Grade Teacher, 60 (6), 42,79.

Cottrell, H.L. (1942). Teaching home safety in wartime. The Instructor, 52 (1), 26.

Davis, O.L., Jr. (1991). Oral history interview with O.L. Davis, Jr. Conducted by George L. Mehaffy, April 12, 9 Oral History in Education Collection, The University of Texas at Austin.

Field, S.L. (1991). Doing their bit for victory: Elementary school social studies during World War II. Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.

Fleming, E. (1943). We who serve. Grade Teacher, 60 (9), 39, 64.

Hanthorn, A. (1942). Taking responsibility. American Childhood, 27 (10), 5.

Laushel, P. (1944). A soldier hears from home. The Instructor, 53 (6), 44.

Moscati, A.J. (1943). They also serve. The Instructor, 52 (7),, 46, 61.

Parton, D. (1943). Giving children a balanced program. Educational Leadership, i (3), 161-164.

Roby, M.F. (1943). Wartime courses of study. The Instructor, 52 (5), 12.

Shuey, B., Rang, B. and others. (1942). The first week in a Pennsylvania school. Progressive Education, 19 (1), 53-59.

The social studies look beyond the war: A statement of postwar policy. (1944). Washington, D.C.: The national Council for the Social Studies.

The social studies mobilize for victory. (1942). Washington,

D.C.: The national Council for the Social Studies.

Southworth, G.V.D. and Southworth, J.V.D. (1942). The American way. Syracuse, New York: Iroquois Publishing Company, Inc.

Sprunk, E. (1943). Primary patriotic seatwork. The Instructor, 52, (8), 10.

Stark, S. and Omer, V.H. (1943). Our flag: A patriotic project with bibliography. Grade Teacher, 60 (9), 38. 56.

Taylor, M.F. (1943). Wartime courses of study. The Instructor, 52 (5), 12.

The wartime handbook of education. (1943). Washington, D.c.: National Education Association.

W. Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnett, 319 U.S.624,63S. Ct. 1178 (1943).

Woods, E.L. (1942). The first day in Los Angeles. Progressive Education, 19 (1) 52-53.

SHAPING MODEL CITIZENS THROUGH RITUALS OF GOOD MANNERS: EXAMPLES FROM GUATEMALAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Ronald W. Wilhelm
University of North Texas

Several years ago, I heard U.S. Representative Jack Brooks (D-Texas) educate a group of Texas Democratic representatives and a few of their constituents about tradition in the House of Representatives. He claimed that the unofficial inner workings of the House system were best captured in a phrase attributed to "Mr. Sam" (Sam Rayburn, D-Texas, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives 1940-47, 1949-1953, 1955-1961). Brooks, quoting Mr. Sam, told the group, "You get along here by goin' along and if you go along, you get along." Embedded in the Texan's folksy philosophy was an understanding of power relationships and the social glue that holds them together. The social knowledge necessary for "getting along" is a crucial to elementary school students as it is to congressional representatives. Formal schooling is nothing if it is not about instilling in the nation's young children a knowledge of what is appropriate behavior in social relations outside school. In addition to specific academic content, teachers also communicate to elementary pupils information, rules, and expectations about proper work habits, hygiene habits, and social habits including respect for authority and patriotic behaviors. Teachers routinely transmit these expectations through class rules, through their daily interactions with their students, and through "rituals of good manners."

The latter category consists of formal, stylized, repeated behaviors that maintain the teacher-student, adult-child, citizen-government authority power dichotomies. Rituals of good manners may be found in a variety of daily school practices such a salutations, formalized oral responses during class participation, conflict resolution, displays of patriotism, and, in some school systems, like Guatemala's, religious dedication of one's daily work. Systematic instruction in ritual behavior provides students with knowledge and skills needed to get along in the microsociety of the classroom and, by extension, in the larger society. An examination of teachings about rituals of good manners can reveal significant elements of the preferred national identity in terms of the expected social behavior of a model citizen.

This paper analyzes several rituals of good manners within the context of Guatemalan public elementary schools. The Guatemalan setting permits a broadening of the analysis to include the relationship of officially taught social behaviors to ethnic relations. In an ethnically plural society, like Guatemala, one ethnic group tends to dominate resources and political power through various situations including the public school system. Historically in Guatemala, the minority <u>ladino</u>

ethnic group, which emphasizes Spanish ancestry, has maintained political and economic domination over the majority indigena or Mayan group. The existing social order can be maintained only if all citizens understand and practice certain prescribed behaviors. The objective of the analysis presented in this paper is to identify in daily classroom practices the ritual behaviors that reproduce and reinforce societal power relationships.

The data for the present analysis were obtained during six months of field research in seven Guatemalan elementary schools in 1990. Some 41 teachers (17 indigena and 24 ladinos) were observed and interviewed. Additionally, curriculum guides, teachers' manuals, and textbooks were examined.

Most observed rituals occurred in the primary grades. These rituals emphasized themes such as respect for authority, piety, and good personal hygiene. Several kindergarten, first, and second grade teachers, in particular, led their children in ritual songs, poems, or prayers in which the children gave thanks for another day, their teacher, and dedicated their day's work to Jesus or God. For example, in a school in the central highlands with a student population that included both ladinos and ladinoized, indigenas, a second grade ladino teacher led her students in the following prayer:

> My little God, we give you thanks for this day of life you have given us and we ask you to illuminate us so that we may understand the classes that our teacher gives us. And we ask for our bread and for that (bread) of all poor children.

In a large city boys' school with mostly ladino students, a third grade ladino teacher began her class each day with a salutation ritual. The teacher told all the students to stand and she said, "Good morning"; to which the class replied in unison, "Good morning." The teacher then asked, "How are you" and the class responded, "Fine, thank you. How are you?" The teacher answered, "I"m fine by the grace of God."

Significantly, the religious rituals were decidedly Christian and, typically, Catholic in nature and were derived from each teacher's own personal religion. Mayan religious rituals or beliefs were not officially sanctioned in the curriculum or in teacher practice. However, these religiously oriented rituals did reinforce both indigenous and mainstream ladino beliefs that one's well-being and fortune were dependent upon a superior entity. An important fatalistic corollary to this belief held that whatever happened, particularly if it was bad, was the will of God. Using this belief system, inequitable power relationships could be justified by the exploited as well as by the dominant power group.

Although rituals of good manners related to respect for the adult authority, in and of themselves, did not openly involve fear, they restated the subordinate power status of children to adults and to teachers, in particular. In situations involving indigena students and ladino teachers, these rituals also reproduced social knowledge and behaviors essential to extant ladino-indigena power relationships. (Only one of the 17 indigena teachers employed rituals of good manners although all pupils in the all-indigena schools demonstrated clearly their respect for their teachers.) For many indigena youngsters, schooling provided their first and, in numerous cases, only systematic exposure to the ladino world view. Thus, the knowledge gained in daily classroom rituals formed the foundation of their understanding of their place in a ladino controlled society.

Failure to perform a ritual appropriately, in some classrooms resulted in public humiliation. The best example of public humiliation and reinforcement of the ladino-indigena relationship was observed in one school with a predominately ladinoized indigena population. When one little girl arrived late one morning, her third grade ladino teacher stopped the lesson and yelled, "Good evening! What do you say when you come in? Go to the door and enter properly." The girl returned to the door and said, "Good morning" but not loudly enough to suit the teacher, who admonished the girl and sent her back to do it again. The girl returned and entered the room again and said, "Good morning, Seño" (an abbreviated form of Señora or Señorita), to which the teacher barked, "What else do you say? Who else is here? You need to say, 'Good morning, Sẽo. Good morning, Professor' because we have a visitor and 'Good morning, children.' Go back and do it correctly!" The girls returned and did it as told in a low voice. The teacher ended this lesson in good manner rituals with a comment to the class: "Those who come in late always interrupt."

A fourth grade ladino teacher at another school, which also was populated with ladinoized indigena students, emphasized rituals of good manners in a disciplined, yet non-hostile, manner. He, like many teachers, taught his students to stand whenever an adult entered the room and to remain standing until he told them to sit. When he gave them permission to sit, the students in unison replied, "Thank you." They also were taught to stand whenever they individually answered a question. Whenever the teacher left the room and re-enter, he demonstrated the polite way to enter a room by asking, "Permiso?" ("May I have your permission to enter) before coming into the room. When one boy arrived late and failed to greet me or the class, the teacher simply reminded him to do so and told the class that if they arrived late they were to greet their classmates in addition to the teacher and not to treat their classmates as "trash."

The preceding examples of salutation rituals demonstrate how children were taught to show respect for adults and for their classmates. The symbolic act of standing in the presence of

adults carried implicit messages of unquestioned obedience to adult authority over the children. Because most of the adults who entered the classrooms were teachers, pupils also learned symbolically their own subordinate and submissive relationship to government authorities.

Besides religious or respect-for-adult themes, several teachers emphasized good personal hygiene in ritual songs, poems, or activities. For example, before allowing their pupils to enter the classroom each morning, teachers in the large city boys' school lined up the youngsters outside the classroom in order to inspect faces and hands for cleanliness. Boys who failed inspection were ordered to wash properly in the school lavatory. A first grade ladino teacher in this school began each day by leading her pupils in singing a "good morning" song that stressed washing faces, hands, teeth, and wearing clean clothes, and hugging mother before leaving for school.

Rituals of cleanliness incarnate an official effort in the curriculum to teach children about the relationship between poor personal hygiene and the many illnesses that debilitate children in Guatemala. As significantly, however, the emphasis on cleanliness in rituals, textbooks, and lessons occurs in a social context in which ladinos have historically viewed indigenas as filthy, superstitious, backward, and untrustworthy. When placed within this context, rituals of good manners that emphasize cleanliness, as well as rituals of piety, and respect/obedience to adult and governmental authority can be interpreted as assimilationist strategies to teach indigena children, in particular, to adopt the preferred ladino lifestyle.

"Getting along," whether in Guatemala or in the United States, requires that children learn basic common social knowledge, attitudes, values, and skills necessary to "go along" with the dominant culture. Daily classroom rituals including songs, pledges, poems, or prayers merit our close analysis in order to determine the implicit, as well as the overt, values and attitudes we are teaching our young citizens. Underlying the cuteness of a song or the patriotic fervor of a pledge or the simple eloquence of a poem, we may discern the preferred characteristics of a model citizen. A critical examination of these qualities of model citizenship officially projected in rituals of good manners, is crucial to an adequate understanding of the relationship between these powerful initial school experiences and subsequent citizenship education.

"YOUR MOTHER WEARS ARMY SHOES!" THE SILLY AND NON-PRODUCTIVE DISPUTE BETWEEN SCHOOL HISTORY AND THE SOCIAL STUDIES

O. L. Davis, Jr.
The University of Texas at Austin

The dispute between school history and the social studies did not begin recently. Its origins lie in the birth of the social studies field and it has continued for 75 years. Moreover, this dispute is apparent in curriculum practice as well as in the rhetoric that describes and nurtures that practice. Most of the time, however, the dispute is hidden from public view by commonplace civility. Public display of linen dirtied by real and perceived hostilities and by harsh, rancorous rhetoric ordinarily is socially unacceptable. These, however, are not ordinary times.

The dispute blazes intensely and openly.

The scene calls to mind a familiar playground image. Unevenly numbered squads of children, separated by some imagined distance, angrily face and shout at one another. They scoff and taunt. Their rampage enlists words they have overheard but which remain unknown. In the fervor of excess, they dig deeply into their emotional pockets and hurl a sharpened dagger, "Your mother wears army shoes!"

Neither side of the disputation prevails except by claim. The dispute is neither resolved nor ended. It is only rejoined at the next opportunity.

What lies behind this dispute? A view of the social studies field over the past 75 years, even a hasty and inadequate view, should aid understanding. Further, it might open possibilities to the dispute's resolution.

IN THE BEGINNING. . .WORDS AND INTIMATIONS

The dispute between school history and the social studies could not be avoided. It came to an immediate full bloom in the 1916 assertion of a "new" social studies to join other subjects in a modern curriculum for American schools.1

Social studies would focus on matters and problems of contemporary social life and would draw principles and concepts primarily from the emerging social disciplines of sociology, economics, and political science. These new empirical disciplines promised prediction and solution of problems. Their subject matter was the present, not a less relevant past. The social studies, therefore, would free students from the prison of an unchangeable past and enable them to face the future. This

new course would point toward citizenship in a democratic American society. Intimately linked with the advocacy of the Cardinal Principles, the new charter for American public education, the social studies carried the cachet of modernity and reason in a progressive age that eschewed the past and tradition.

The new rhetoric overwhelmed usage. The social studies term "stuck" in the language of American education. Possessing attractive currency, the term quickly all but displaced history in educational discourse. Creation of the National Council for the Social Studies surely signaled the suitability of the term as a positive as well as a political slogan. Acceptance of the term, if not its meanings, must have seemed assured when the American Historical Association established its Commission on the Social Studies.

As is so often the case, acceptance of terminology is anemic symbol of fundamental reorientation of reality. The substitution of **social studies for school history**, and sometimes, **school geography**, was a minor shift of labels on curriculum documents. Probably a more important development was the adoption of the social studies term to describe the broad field of social subjects conventionally offered. In effect, this usage possessed the twin virtues of the legitimation of the new term and the recognition of the political viability of school history. This short-term gain, however, only obscured the fundamental confusion it created about the field and its legitimation. Still, in practical curriculum reality, history maintained its prominence with the newly fashioned social studies.2

Only a very few practical changes in offerings between 1920 and 1940 mirrored the socially preferred terminology of the social studies. Still, these few developments were important. Without a doubt, they influenced perceptions about the new social studies and helped popularize its claims.

Harold Rugg's new social studies course was one of the first of these prominent changes. History and geography were not only rejected as its principal pillars, but this course conspicuously drew substantive knowledge from the new social sciences into its organization. Also remarkable for the times was Rugg's attentiveness to the new orthodoxy of curriculum making by objectives and to the use of the new technology of educational research in course development.3

The new senior-level Problems of Democracy course had a much rockier road to creation. In its most orthodox form, it focused on contemporary social problems (not just "issues") and teachers and students selected the problems that the classes would study. Teachers and students directly inquired into the problems, most of a local nature, engaged in local community action projects, and sought recorded substantive knowledge from those social sciences thought most to contribute to the problems' solutions. History was not excluded from studies in this course, but it was not emphasized.4

Development of the core curriculum during the PEA-sponsored Eight Year Study represented a major development within the social studies movement. Parallel with development of the core curriculum were the creation of classroom materials and procedures for the analysis of propaganda, for the study of human relations and stereotypes, and for the consideration of personal and social values. These fresh innovations easily became embodied in social studies as well as other courses.5

The social studies never overthrew school history from the curriculum. It supported prominent advocacies within the field and provided popular illustrations of a vigorous educational progressivism. On the other hand, the social studies ideology dominated only the rhetoric of the field. Amidst the general clamor of repeated claims for the social studies, only a few voices reminded the field of the continuing practical curriculum realities, but they, for the most part, were not heard. They would be.

THE ERUPTION OF DISCONTENTS: RHETORICS UNLEASHED

For half a century, the once simmering dispute between history and the social studies has erupted time and again. It has attracted widespread public attention to the field. Also, it has nurtured vigorous and often successful attacks against modern school practices. The dispute has been intemperate in the extreme and its partisans clearly have staked reputations and careers on its outcome. Moreover, with the recent addition of powerful political and intellectual voices, the dispute has escalated to a new intensity.

Historian Arthur Bestor fired the first major salvos toward the recovery of school history. To be sure, his was a full-scale assault on progressive education, but his sharpest aim savaged the social studies. He derided the new field and its courses as "social stew" and insisted that history be restored without encumbrance to the school curriculum. Others with fewer academic credentials took Bestor's place when he returned to his personal scholarship and teaching. Their attacks never coalesced into a crusade, but "basic education," including the advocacy of a vibrant school history, became a significant and continuing feature of educational politics.6

The dispute seemed to diminish during the 1960s. Actually, the energies it normally invoked were directed to other matters. In effect, voiced disputation took another form.

Throughout the 1960s, advocates of school history were busy fleshing out courses for the New Social Studies fostered by the curriculum notions of scholars like Bruner, Fenton, and Taba. Inquiry procedures were popularized. Also stressed were the use of original documents, the writing of historical accounts and generalizations, and the study of a few selected topics ("post-

holing") rather the coverage of many, undifferentiated topics.

Partisans of the conventional social studies did not oppose these developments. Neither, however, did they enthusiastically support them. Within a revised theoretic tempest, they fashioned newly reasoned legitimations for a social studies, even a discipline of social studies, separate from history and the social sciences and whose major purpose was citizenship education. Additionally, they seemed eager to embrace the programmatic opportunities for a number of proposed concerns or emphases, for example, global education, multi-cultural education, even law-related and economic education. Among proposals for renewed attention to moral and value considerations, problem-centered social studies educators, conceptualized dimensions of community study and of active student involvement in participant politics.7

By the mid-1970s, the bloom of the New Social Studies had wilted. Schools abandoned most of the new courses and the once-new textbooks and related materials were stored in dark and forgotten corners of seldom entered bookrooms, if kept at all. Most teachers, having complained that the new emphases, including inquiry, were suitable only to gifted students, welcomed new versions of discursive textbooks. Critically important to recognize, the abandonment of the New Social Studies was **not** abandonment of school history. Teachers and schools simply returned to the conventional version of school history.8

In all likelihood, these activities represented the persisting rhetorical dispute, albeit in a different form. Parties to the dispute continued their advocacies with regard only to their asserted rationales and consequences. Almost always, the rhetorical war raged far from the arena of the practical. The inflamed rhetoric routinely ignored teachers. They tended to reciprocate by ignoring the theoretic storms. This condition persists.

ENOUGH! ENOUGH! THIS DISPUTE MUST END

Recently, this dispute has turned both mean and ugly. Its rhetoric assails proposals advanced by the other group, belligerently challenges the legitimations offered, and suggests a harvest of horrors as consequences of the adoption of any proposal.9 The dispute is alive, but it is no longer viable. It is silly and non-productive. It must end.

As long as few were effected, the dispute added color and some noise and excitement to gatherings of social studies educators. It really never related to practical dimensions of school courses and teaching. In curriculum reality, school history always was and continues to be offered. The dispute was and is largely the enterprise of university professors, central office administrators, publicists, and other non-teaching "experts". Now, the dispute mars efforts for basic renewal of

the social studies field. Additionally, it diverts attention and energy from the profoundly needed improvements in the nature and teaching of school history.

School history deserves better. So does the social studies. Without question, both should be transformed. An enlivened school history is necessary. American schools must reemphasize citizenship and civility, but not within the private territory of the social studies. In this larger concern, a rich, substantive new school history must play a substantial role. So, too, should other school courses, ones in the social studies field and those in other areas as well.10 The practical must be emphasized over the theoretic.11

Time and tolerance for playground insults is exhausted. Recess is over. Serious work for the renewal of social studies and school history must begin.

ENDNOTES

1 See, for example, David Warren Saxe, **Social Studies in Schools; A History of the Early Years** (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991); Michael Bruce Lybarger, "The Historiography of Social Studies: Retrospect Circumspect, and Prospect," in **Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning**, ed. James P. Shaver (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1991), 3-; Hazel Hertzberg, **Social Studies Reform: 1880-1890** (Boulder, Co: Social Science Educational Consortium, 1981); Robert Barr, James Barth, and Samuel S. Shermis, **The Nature of the Social Studies** (Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications, 1987).

2 This conclusion really holds only for the American secondary school curriculum. In the elementary school curriculum, separate history and geography offerings in the middle grades (4-6) once quite widespread, have ceded ground to integrated social studies offerings. These so-called integrated offerings and their accompanying textbooks, nevertheless, have accorded prominence to both history and geography. Recently, major calls to replace current elementary school programs with separate history and geography offerings have secured increased public and professional support.

3 Herbert Kliebard and Greg Wegner, "Harold Rugg and the Reconstruction of the Social Studies Curriculum: The Treatment of the "Greats War" in His Textbook Series," in **The Formation of the School Subjects: The Struggle for Creating an American Institution**, ed. T. S. Popkewitz (London: Falmer, 1987), 268-287. See, also, Murry R. Nelson, "Building a Science of Society: The Social Studies and Harold Rugg" (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1975).

4 William W. Joyce, Timothy H. Little, and Stanley P. Wronski, "Scope and Sequence, Goals, and Objectives: Effects on Social Studies," in **Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning**, ed. James P. Shaver (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1991), 321-331.

5 Wilford M. Aiken, **The Story of the Eight Year Study with Conclusions and Recommendations** (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942); Hazel Hertzberg, **Historical Parallels for the Sixties and the SEventies: Primary Sources and Core Curriculum Revisited** (Boulder, Co: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, 1971).

6 Arthur E. Bestor, **Educational Wastelands: The Retreat from Learning in Our Public Schools** (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1953). See also, Herbert Kliebard, **The Struggle for the American Curriculum** (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986).

7 See, for example, Shirley H. Engle and Anna S. Ochoa. **Education for Democratic Citizenship: Decision Making in the Social Studies** (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988); Walter Parker and Theodore Kaltsounis, "Citizenship and Law-Related Education," In **Elementary Social Studies: Research as a Guide to Practice**, ed. Virginia Atwood (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1986), 14-33.

8 James P. Shaver, O. L. Davis, Jr., and Suzanne W. Helborn, **An Interpretive Report on the Status of Pre-College Social Studies Education Based on Three NSF-Funded Studies** (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1978).

9 See, for example, Diane Ravitch and Chester Finn, **What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know?** (New York: Harper and Row, 1987); Paul Gagnon and the Bradley Commission on History in Schools (Ed.), **Historical LIteracy: The Case for History in American Education** (New York: Macmillan, 1989); David Jeness, **Making Sense Of Social Studies** (New York, Macmillan, 1990); Paul A. Gagnon, "To Critics: Please Read What We Say," **History Matters!** 3 (April, 1991), 1, 5. A recent organizational effort at rapprochement produced **Charting a Course: Social Studies for the 21st Century** (Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools, 1989). This report, however, met a mixed reception. Note, especially, several strongly argued supporting and dissenting positions about the Commission report in **Social Education** 54 (November/December 1990) and **Social Education** 55 (January 1991).

10 O. L. Davis, Jr., "Citizenship Education as the Central Purpose of the Social Studies: The Heavy Load of a Dead Metaphor," in **Thinking About the Social Studies: Some Specific Ideas About the Discipline** (Chicago, IL: NCSS Foundations of the Social Studies Special Interest Group, 1991), 39-43. See, also, Sandra Stotsky, ed., **Connecting Civic Education and Language Education; The Contemporary Challenge** (New York: Teachers College Press, 1991).

11 See, particularly, Joseph J. Schwab, **The Practical: A Language for Curriculum** (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1970).

EXPLORING LIBERAL-DEMOCRATIC DIALOGUE IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES

David Warren Saxe
Pennsylvania State University

As social studies educators we need to contribute to the discussion of what is meant by democratic character, to help determine what should be taught and how, and to identify and celebrate those factors that unite individuals as well as those differences that should be accepted. Typically, the first requirement of liberal-democratic education is to contribute to freeing the individual from ignorance (this is what is meant by liberal education). The second requirement is to model and promote experiences where democratic dispositions and practices can emerge, where reasoned thought and action can be actualized.

In the context of this research, democratic dialogue is defined as a curricular and pedagogical disposition that educators should exercise with students to foster the identification, practice, consideration, and inculcation of democratic principles. In specifics, democratic dialogue is characterized by six sustained principles that:

1. provide for open participation on public issues that includes a meaningful voice and role in community and societal affairs;
2. ensure access to information for the purpose of responsible decision making;
3. acknowledge the diversity of human forms and ideas, including a sensitivity or awareness toward various creeds, religious beliefs, capacities, opinions and other personally held convictions;
4. support equal treatment and consideration of all citizens on matters with social implications;
5. desire maintenance of and a reasoned respect for law, property, and human rights; and
6. highlight the acceptance of social obligations to reciprocate service and loyalty to society in exchange for the protection and promotion of individual liberty.

The history or record of democratic dialogue in public schools, however, is neither long or healthy. A recent study that sought to reveal democratic dispositions and participation in rural schools highlights a telling and common observation: public schools are not very democratic places (Schmuck and Schmuck, 1990). Operating with the assumption that large urban schools are too big for democracy and that small rural schools should be ideal for democracy, the authors of the study set upon a 21 state trek to find out the level of democratic participation in schools. The results demonstrated that although some students, teachers, principals and other school leaders

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

appreciated democratic dispositions, few actually engaged themselves in any organized democratic activities in schools on a daily basis, if ever.

The existence of undemocratic schools may alarm some educational theorists and a few concerned citizens, however, to others, the idea of a democratic school in the sense of a cooperating/collaborating body of citizens where decisions are reached through a consensus or voting and participation is not coerced or even demanded is fine for discussion, but not a very good idea in practice. On one hand educators and other interested parties have been so caught up in what students need to know that they perhaps unknowingly defeat democratic spirit and inquiry. On the other hand, other powerful factors often come to dominate curricular policy.

The first national organization that sought to bring the practice of democratic dialogue into public schools was the Committee on the Social Studies (Dunn, 1916), sponsored by the National Education Association. Operating as a deliberative body between 1912 and 1920, the Committee suggested that children become active participants to benefit the general welfare of their community, state, and nation. The Committee stressed the importance of responsible citizenship not as a mere casual voter, but a genuine active contributor to the health of the community. The social studies notion of the participating student as citizen was very different than the prevailing practice of the student as a receptacle of inert historical information.

The Committee issued three reports. The primary author of the Social Studies Committee of the 1915 and final 1916 report was Arthur W. Dunn, who was listed as compiler and secretary of the Committee. Inspired by the theoretical constructions and suggestions of his mentors Albion Small and George Vincent at the University of Chicago as well as John Dewey another former Chicago professor (Dunn credits all three in his 1907 community civic textbook), Dunn worked to apply the notion of the socially responsible citizen with children in public schools. Dunn's social studies was developed in the early 1900s when he was a director of civic education in the Indianapolis public schools.

At first Dunn labeled this work community civics, however, in an expanded version directed at elementary schools (published as a US Bureau of Education Bulletin in 1915), Dunn used the term social studies to describe the use of community civics, geography and history. In Dunn's work, children were viewed as active participants in improving community life. In the 1916 Social Studies report, the ninth grade community civics course and the culminating Problems of Democracy course suggested for the twelfth grade, highlighted Dunn's view of students and teachers as active participants in democratic dialogue.

Although these courses showed promise, neither was able to emerge from the 1920s as an enduring, dominant force in American education. One major reason for the failure of these courses

(and a continuing challenge for social studies as well) was the crippling effect of America's entrance and participation in World War One. Like men, money, and material, schools were mobilized to support the war effort. Where the idea of participating citizens was certainly encouraged, the idea of unfettered democratic participation in schools was reduced to silence. Simply put, the war directed curricular efforts in schools to service political policy. This action directly hampered the successful introduction of the full social studies program in public schools where democratic dialogue may have emerged.

Thus, the problems of social studies did not evolve from stagnation or some slow type of curricular decay over the past seventy years, but were manifest from the start in a series of intellectual battles over freedom in schools between those who wished to engage in democratic dialogue and those who sought to suppress democratic dialogue.

Democratic dialogue hinges upon three basic issues or constraints:

1. personal freedom of teachers as individual citizens;
2. freedom of teachers to discuss/introduce/make inquiries on controversial issues from a number of perspectives (even unpopular views); and
3. freedom of teachers to discuss/introduce/make inquiries on controversial issues from a status quo perspective.

During the deliberation of the social studies committee, progressive area politics engaged all three issues. For example, teachers were struggling with the 19th century perspective of the teacher-as-model-citizen both in and out of school. This is the teacher who at the peril of being dismissed, could not drink, dance, go out at night, walk unescorted in town, play cards, attend movies, date members of the opposite sex and more. During the pre-war years, the standards of the community were deeply rooted in religious fervor and teachers were expected to be exemplary (Beale, 1941, p. 170-171).

The World War, however, broke down the old standards. As Howard Beale Wrote, "old conceptions of morality, long established social controls, and ancient standards of conduct were destroyed by wartime [activity]" (p. 235). Teacher, many of whom were now college graduates viewed the world with more cynicism and were truly hopeful that they could make a difference. As Beale noted, these new "attitudes were certain to cause trouble in most American communities" (p. 235).

The social studies report was written at a time when moral standards were being challenged. However, it was unlikely that public school teachers were free to act in their personal/private lives on controversial public issues. In addition, it was unlikely that teachers were free to openly challenge or even discuss public policy/issues/opinions/norms in class. Thus, it should not be surprising that the social studies reports did not

attend to the first or second issues of freedom specifically. Instead, the social studies reports highlighted "acceptable" controversial issues such as sanitary conditions in the community (third issue). Nonetheless, given the philosophical direction of the committee reports in the context of pre-war America, I believe that had the United States not entered the war, social studies theorists might have grappled with the thornier issues of personal freedom and unfettered democratic dialogue.

WAR AND SOCIAL STUDIES REFORM[1]

What did the war do to social studies? When the United States became indirectly and later directly involved in World War I, strict laws and other "unofficial" sanctions were made to repress certain opinions and actions regarding belligerents, in particular Germany (see Judge Advocate, 1919; Pierce, 1926). One of the victims of this policy was the 1916 Social Studies' suggestion of a Problems of Democracy course. The Committee report, produced in the spirit of progressive humanitarianism, inevitably clashed with the martial spirit necessary for war. Even sympathetic progressives who came to embrace the war effort understood the toll war would extract from American institutions and people.

In selling the notion of war to the American people, Wilson himself attempted to "preserve. . . humanitarian feelings by couching the entry into the war, and the later peace negotiations, in the language and rhetoric of the progressive movement" (Perkinson, 1968, p. 197). Yet, as Richard Hofstadter noted, by associating the war with progressive rhetoric and progressive values, Wilson "unintentionally insured that the reaction against Progressivism would be intense" (1955, p. 278). By uniting the reality of war and the necessary martial spirit for fighting with progressivism "the American people [came to] repudiate progressivism")Hofstadter as cited in Perkinson, 1968, p. 197-198). Thus, for the social studies, rather than being celebrated as a balanced approach to confronting controversial issues with democratic dialogue, initially the 1916 report became a casualty of war due to its association with progressive ideology.

The point, however, is not to debate American government policy during wartime, but to note that the type of academic freedom necessary to nourish an open-forum-style course was leveled by 1917. Simply put, the war created a "war hysteria" in the United States that made objective and impartial analysis and discussion of war issues inside or outside the classroom impossible.[2] Clearly, the freedom to hold certain opinions or to speak out on issues was literally absent in public schools. On fear of dismissal or worse, a jail sentence, teachers either avoided war issues altogether or, more likely, strictly followed accepted policy and accepted official war information.

Remarkable, among the first to enlist in the war effort were academic historians.[3] Historian James Shotwell of Columbia

University, at the request of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, that saw the war against Germany as "an opportunity to reconstruct the international organization of the world," organized the National Board for Historical Service by resolution of the American Historical Association on April 29, 1917. In addition to the connection to the Carnegie group and the AHA, the Board also worked in close cooperation with the Committee on Public Information and the Bureau of Education. The Board, acting in a "semi-official" advisory position, came to represent some three thousand historian by 1918. The Board's membership included Shotwell, who was named chair, and several leading historians-educators such as Henry Johnson, Frederick Jackson Turner, James Schafer, and William Lingelbach, among others.[4]

The mission of the Board was to "prepare literature" for public schools related to the war that supported and justified American war efforts. Clearly, one "truth" had been decided upon at the outset: German leadership and its militaristic philosophy were responsible for the Great War. The task of the historians was to confirm this assertion, which they did with conviction.

Henry Johnson and the Board's "principle avenue of expression' to school teachers was no less that Albert McKinley's The History Teacher's Magazine and his publishing firm. the same publication had been the open forum of debate between the traditional historians and the social studies insurgents since 1909. Incidentally, as war neared, responses to the 1916 Social Studies report (that was published in the magazine three months before the American declaration of war on April 6, 1917), as well as the continuing debate between traditional historians and social studies insurgents, promised by the editors of The History Teachers' magazine, never materialized. Instead, the war led the magazine's editors, together with the historians, to close ranks and shut out the insurgents.[5]

One explanation for this action could have been a result of the anti-history tenor of the 1916 report and that history study was then needed to support the war effort. Speculation aside, the fact remains that none of the principal authors of the 1916 social studies, except James Lynn Barnard 91918), were able to publish any articles for the magazine relating to the social studies between 1917 and 1919. At any rate, by design or circumstance, the war effectively silenced the insurgents. Even in the report itself, despite being prepared and disseminated during the war, only one vague reference was made regarding the World War through an exercise on the question of neutrality in the War of 1812 (Dunn, 1916, pp. 44-45).[6] Although current problems were an important aspect of the report, the 1916 document virtually remained silent on one of the most critical issues of the day: the Great War and related war concerns and issues.

Some explanation is warranted as to why the suggestions of 1916 report, in particular, the Problem of Democracy course never

realized the potential inherent in its design. As the late Lawrence Metcalf's response to the question "Whatever happened to the Social Studies?" explains, 'social studies did not fail, it was never tried" (1986). The context of Metcalf's statement, that reflected the intention of the 1916 insurgents, referred to the failure of "social studies" teachers to use experimentation, honest reflection, and persistent and unvarnished examination of social, cultural, economic, religious, or political issues with students. With the steady outpour of anti-German articles, written by or through the National Board for Historical Service, and with the backing of popular opinion for the Allied cause, open dialogue on such issues as neutrality, imperialism, propaganda, war atrocities, and war guilt was impossible to treat in schools.

Moreover, by 1918, the National Education Association, too, seemingly turned its back on the 1916 Committee report by asking the national Board, then under the sponsorship of the American Historical Association, to re-examine the public school curriculum. The Board then organized the Committee on History and education for Citizenship naming one of its own members as chair (James Schafer). Henry Johnson also served on this committee as well. None of the leaders of the 1916 Social Studies Committee took an active role in the National Board for Historical Service, nor any of its related agencies. Henry Johnson, by contrast, was an original member of the Board and prepared the "general scheme," according to Harold Rugg (1921), of the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship report.

Eventually war hysteria ended by 1920. However, the damage done to the social studies was not so easily overcome. In fact, the argument could be made that the war helped the historians maintain some degree of curricular control through the potent appeal of patriotism; history could explain why America had to assist the Allies to defeat Germany. The war emphasized and increased the study of history in schools and this condition helped the traditional historians case. On the other hand, by highlighting the need for the study of modern history, the war undermined and eventually dismantled traditional history's key concept, "historical continuity." This rendered Ancient and Medieval History, the foundational rock of the Committee Seven's four-block system expendable (McLaughlin, 1899). This condition served to confirm one of the key concepts of social studies, "the present should be the focus of social studies."

In sum, where the war both helped and hurt the case for traditional history, the effect on the emerging social studies was more pronounced. Although historians during the Great War had succeeded in standardizing-maintaining the history curriculum, following the war the old, submerged curricular chaos returned. Largely through the efforts of the national Council for the Social Studies established in 1921), social studies became established in theoretical circles during the 1920s and 1930s. The battle between traditionalists and the insurgent social studies theorists, however, has continued.

Today, the issue of personal freedom for teachers has been secured for most teachers. The issue of freedom to engage in democratic dialogue, however, continues to be problematic. As we have witnessed in recent years, particularly in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, there is something very appealing about democratic dispositions and opportunities. As an idea, democracy is a dynamic phenomenon that has the potential to unite all human life regardless of language, race, or culture. The logic of democracy is revealed in practice and application--not merely as a means to unite and sustain disparate individuals, but because of its potential to highlight equality, human rights, and freedom.

Democracy, however, is also very fragile. Democracy depends upon a willingness of diverse people to unite as well as a fostering of sustained and open dialogue between individuals. Unless citizens become cognizant of and actively interested in its continuation, democracy can be overwhelmed by other competing forces. If democracy is to survive and flourish, individuals must receive and be part of an education that is both enlightening and provides opportunities for practice and application of democratic dialogue. The original social studies proposal that established the forum for exploring democratic dialogue needs to be revisited and discussed. The consequences of our actions or non-actions as social studies educators, then as now, holds a significant voice in determining the kind of society our students will or will not embrace and cherish.

References

Barnard, J. L. (1918). A program of civics teaching for war times and after. **Historical Outlook**. 9(9).

Beale, H. (1914). **History of freedom of teaching in American schools**. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Dunn, A. W. (1915). **Civic education in elementary schools as illustrated in Indianapolis**. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1915, Washington, DC: GPO.

Dunn, A. W. (1907). **The community and the citizen**. Boston: DC Heath.

Dunn, A. W. (1916). **Social studies in secondary schools**. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1916. Washington, DC: GPO.

Hofstadter, R. (1955). **The age of reform**. New York: Vintage.

Judge Advocate General of the Army. (1919). **Compilation of war laws of the various states and insular possessions**. Washington, DC: GPO.

McLaughlin, A. et al. (1899). **The study of history in schools.** New York: Macmillan.

Metcalf, L. A. (1986). Whatever happened to social studies? **Lawrence Metcalf Colloquium.** University of Illinois.

Perkinson, H. J. (1968). **The imperfect panacea.** New York: Random House.

Pierce, B. L. (1926). **Public opinion and the teaching of history.** New York: Alfred Knopf.

Rugg, H. (1921). Needed changes in the committee procedure on reconstructing the social studies. **Elementary School Journal.** 21.

Schmuck, P. & Schmuck, R. (1990). Democratic participation in small-town schools. **Educational Researcher.** 19(8).

Endnotes

1. Adapted from Saxe, D. W. (1992). **Social studies in schools: A history of the early years.** Albany, NY: States University of New York Press.

2. Arthur Link claimed that "Probably a majority of Americans were mildly pro-Allied. . .by 1914." and despite German and British propaganda they most likely decided upon the rightness of the Allied cause long before America's entry into the War. Therefore, the notion of debating war issues was not viewed as thoughtful thinking, it was viewed as treason. See, Link, A. (1963). **Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era.** New York: Harper Torchbooks.

3. The irony between historians and social studies insurgents on war issue was that the historians supported the Allied cause, although they owed much of their tradition to Germany; where the social studies insurgents remained silent on the war in the 1916 report, although they owed much of their tradition to the earlier English reform movement.

4. The Board was designed to serve the country during the war years and was dissolved in 1919. The organization of the Board was continued as part of the American Historical Association. In fact, Board members Schafer (who was named chair) and Johnson (who wrote major sections of the report) served on the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship that sought to extend the Board's agenda into the "return to normalcy."

5. The **History Teacher's Magazine**, retitled **The Historical Outlook** in 1918, filled every issue between late 1916 and 1919 with war related articles. Amid an almost rabid devotion to the Allied cause and, consequently, a savage anti-German attitude, the magazine printed suggested teaching ideas, readings, course

outlines, and more all slanted toward Allied powers and policy. Several key articles were reprinted and distributed to schools by McKinley's press. Factual materials that would have cast doubts upon the "rightness" of the Allied cause (and America's entry into the war) were not treated seriously or omitted entirely.

6. The reference to the War of 1812 may provide an example of the Committee's political context, that is, a balanced, if not, "openly" neutral position. The question of maintaining neutrality was hotly contested on the approach of "Mr. Madison's War" in America c. 1812. Therefore, the analogy is that given the facts the prudent course for America c. 1916 would be to remain neutral and let the Europeans fight it out. The popularity of the War of 1812 and the shift toward an intense nationalistic fervor came after the war, not before. In using this example, the Committee may have been hopeful that teachers would lead students to consider a peace-neutrality (thus keeping an open mind) as an alternative to war.

AMERICA 2000 GOAL 3: A REACTIONARY REFORM OF CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

James L. Barth
Purdue University

> But the most serious failings of social studies are conceptual, philosophical, even ideological. Simply stated what most "experts" in the field want students to learn is not what most parents and citizens expect them to know.
>
> Chester E. Finn (1988)

A reactionary reform of citizenship education is finally at the door of social studies. That is not new, reforms of many kinds have been threatening for a century. But now, for the first time since the creation of the social studies field, teachers have a forced choice. Citizenship education has become a political agenda rather than an educational concern. In short, the question of how schools should prepare citizens for citizenship has been politicized by the Bush administration educational reforms suggested in America 2000 Goal 3. Thus, teachers have a choice: accept the proposed reform or defend social studies as the best approach to citizenship education.

SOCIAL STUDIES WAS THE ORIGINAL EDUCATIONAL REFORM OF CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Obviously, if there is a reactionary reform, there must have been a prior reform. That prior reform in teaching citizenship education was the educational reform called social studies some 75 years ago, an educational reform that has its roots firmly set in the progressive era, a time in American history of local, state, and national reforms. Social studies was intended to reform 19th century citizenship education when history, geography, and government were treated as separate subjects dedicated to inculcating and molding children to a set of values and beliefs. The content and the concerns of those separate subjects were essentially centered on the past with emphasis upon a passion for democracy. Citizenship in that era was designed for a static society, essentially rural, where small towns and villages exercised a strong influence over the education of its youth. The social studies reform was intended to integrate history, the social sciences and humanities, and concentrate on personal problems and social issues of the present and prepare for the future. The purpose was to equip students for a changing world with decision making citizenship skills necessary for participation in a 20th century democracy. All of these ideas, i.e., change, social problems, integration, decision making, democracy became the basic foundation of the social studies field. In short, social studies was to prepare a citizen for a world of chaotic rapid change, interdependence, and a

technologically sophisticated society where values and beliefs are constantly challenged.

WHAT ARE THE BASIC BELIEFS?

In short, contrary to the opinions of many critics, social studies as citizenship education is based upon the following four foundational beliefs: (1) social studies is citizenship education; (2) the social sciences and humanities concepts are interdisciplinary integrated for instructional purposes; (3) the proper content of the social studies is persistent and contemporary social/personal problems expressed as concepts, topics, and themes; and (4) citizenship education requires the practice of problem solving/decision making throughout a social studies curriculum. Thus, a definition of social studies might be:

> **Social studies is the interdisciplinary integration of social science and humanities concepts for the purpose of practicing problem solving, decision making citizenship skills on critical social issues.**

The beliefs of social studies have been under critical attack for all of its 75 years on the grounds that the field usurped the traditional teaching of history in the schools.[1] That criticism is alive and well and deeply embedded in the educational reform America 2000. "Specifically Goal 3 [of America 2000] calls for American students [to] leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including. . .history and geography."[2] With the hope of being included in the decision making process in response to the America 2000 reform initiative, the National Council for the Social studies (NCSS) Board of Directors at its July 1991 meeting passed the following motion, "to achieve a broader vision of social studies [meaning broader than history and geography] in the current education reform initiative [Goal 3] by working for the inclusion of civics and government and economics, and, while strongly supporting history and geography, working for the expansion of an international dimension to both."[3] In addition to this motion the president of NCSS, Margit McGuire, sent a letter interpreting the motion to each member of the National Council on Education Standards and Testing (NCEST), the council which is establishing the standards and tests which will be used to evaluate students at the 4th, 8th, and 12th grade levels. In McGuire's letter she states, "We [NCSS] agree that history and geography are central to the social studies," and she also states that, "history teaching and learning should be. . .organized chronologically." She concludes the letter, "We welcome the setting of standards for learning and assessment in history and geography. As essential as these disciplines are, they are not sufficient for a liberal education." She goes on to point out that, "government/civics and economics play an integral role in modern life.[4]

Actually when one reads the motion passed by the NCSS Board

and President McGuire's letter, one does not sense that citizenship education and social studies as a field have become a political agenda at the highest level. The agenda includes a reactionary reform which is now at the door of NCSS and all social studies classrooms. Social studies teachers need to discuss the serious implications of America 2000 Goal 3 for that reform will significantly change citizenship education, social studies, and teaching.

SOME SUGGESTIONS ABOUT NCEST BELIEFS ON CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AND WHAT IS MEANT BY REFORM

The NCSS Board of Directors in its July meeting listened to informal comments by one of the members of NCEST. These comments interpreted how NCEST members seemed to think about (1) citizenship education, (2) social studies educational reform, and (3) the Council's perception of the world. NCEST did not want to hear the terms social studies or citizenship education because the field is held responsible for a "lack of forging knowledgeable citizens with a passion for democracy,"[5] The inference was that chronological, disciplinary driven history and geography were the proper conveyers of the American tradition. NCEST members did not want to hear the words **global studies** because these words come too close to the notion of "one-worldism," interdependence,[6] and suggest the idea that the United States is part of a world system.

However, NCEST was willing to hear the word international studies which carries with it a different, much more limited connotation than global. They were also willing to hear Eurocentric and western civilization for these parts of the world were for them the most important. NCEST did not want to hear the words diverse cultures, but did want to hear about unity, meaning it is time the country comes together in a common cause. Diversity is tearing the country apart. Unity is what we had in the past, and it is what we as a people need now, so emphasize unity says NCEST. They did not want to hear the word multicultural, interpreting this to mean hostility and racial separatism. NCEST members believe it is no longer politically correct to hear social studies, global studies, multicultural because they tend to be divisive, divisive because American citizens are being encouraged to see themselves as hyphenated people: Greek-Americans, African-Americans, Mexican-Americans, Japanese-Americans. Representative Bill Emerson, R-MO summarized the political agenda in a recent speech, "our vision of America is one nation, indivisible--not splintered by language, or race, or ethnic fragmentation."[7] The obvious assumption of the present political agenda is that global, multicultural, a concept of diversity, and social studies as a field do not fit the political requirements of a contemporary citizenship education program but U.S. history and geography do.

In summary, NCEST is suggesting a reactionary reform of citizenship education. The Council seems to emphasize a return to the pre-social studies era 19th century form of Euro-centric

centered citizenship education where values laden content was stressed and an uncritical passion for democracy was taught. Any national testing will surely reflect this reactionary view. If NCEST intends testing only history and geography, which narrows the perspective of the world to western culture, and in particular to a traditional North American culture as viewed from a 19th century Anglicized perspective, then the question is, Should NCSS, the social sciences not included in Goal 3, and the social studies classroom teacher cooperate with NCEST proposed testing?

WHAT SHOULD BE THE NCSS REACTION TO AMERICA 2000 GOAL 3 CITIZENSHIP AGENDA?

The question is complex because it is about fundamental beliefs on how citizens should be prepared for a democratic society in the 21st century. Any attempt to provide a short statement about the conflicting views on the question will be an over-simplification. The question remains, How should the NCSS respond to America 2000 Goal 3? There are essentially two broad positions. The first position is the one adopted by the NCSS Board of Directors: in essence to join the America 2000 Goal 3 reactionary reform, not essentially agreeing with the reform, but hoping to affect the agenda of that reform from within. The other position is that NCSS should reject the America 200 Goal 3 reform, define social studies as the original educational reform of citizenship education, 75 years ago, and publicize basic core beliefs of the social studies movement, believing that the political climate will change, that social studies as an issue will be depoliticized, and that America 2000 Goal 3 as a suggested educational reform will fail.

FIRST POSITION:
STAY IN THE GAME AND BE A VOICE FOR TEACHERS
"Words Will Never Harm Me!"

It is important for the NCSS to be a voice which is heard, rather than a voice which is discounted. To maintain an adversarial position would too easily allow NCSS to simply be ignored. The NCSS constituency, classroom teachers, would be ill served if the steam roller of America 200 Goal 3 reform proceeds in its disastrous ways without NCSS trying to divert it at least a little. The motion passed by the Board does not support American history as the top priority; rather it seeks to expand the push for American history, if not beyond history then at least beyond American. If using the term "international" instead of "global" is less threatening, then maybe this small difference can be made. Similarly if discussing civics and government, rather than citizenship means expanding the current drive beyond history and geography, so much the better. NCSS cannot desert teachers to the current reform movements; it must be realistic in order to have a voice. It must join other professional organizations, such as those social sciences that were excluded from Goal 3, to change the reformers minds. As it is, too little of what passes for social studies in the schools is influenced by

41 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the basic beliefs of the social studies movement. Those in policy making positions in Washington and at the state level should not be allowed to simply reject NCSS and social studies out of hand. A strategic choice of language is called for, i.e., international instead of global, unity instead of diversity, and U.S. history and geography instead of citizenship education. To make changes NCSS must speak with a voice that will be attended to.

One course of action would be to get good, well informed people politically active who have a social studies agenda and strong ties to NCSS and encourage and support them. This would mean tempering blatant opposition (as an organization) to America 2000 Goal 3, and working from the inside to influence directions where and when possible, even though NCSS may not be able to change the list of academics or the areas which will be tested. However, NCSS can, given the opportunity to get inside each of the current (history and geography) and proposed (civics and economics) areas influence the subject areas' direction significantly. NCSS can also gain visibility, prestige as an organization, and inside information to assist in getting the organization's own house in order on issues of national importance.

SECOND POSITION:
DEFEND THE BASIC BELIEFS OF SOCIAL STUDIES

It is an important argument that the NCSS needs to join the fray by getting inside and trying to change the minds of those who are about to make decisions on the standards and testing of our children, i.e., NCEST. It is true that if NCSS were to stand now by its values and beliefs, it would have few voices other than its own to support a social studies point of view. The question is, Will there be another day if NCSS joins the reactionary reform?, because by the mid-point of this decade there may be no social studies history and geography as shaped by a political agenda and a national test to enforce the shaping? By tacitly agreeing with NCEST does NCSS seriously compromise itself? It is perfectly obvious that educational goals for America 2000 Goal 3 do not include social studies as a field. Does the NCSS now join the America 2000 effort knowing how some of those who serve on NCEST think about social studies? In short, dare NCSS join a movement that is dedicated to eradicating the field? Chester Finn, Lynne Cheney, and David Kearns, all of whom serve on NCEST have spoken eloquently on reasons why the field should be eliminated from the school curriculum. "The Great dismal swamp of today's school curriculum is not reading or writing. . .it is social studies. . .a subject students seldom like, and one that is doing a wretched job of forging historically knowledgeable citizens with a passion for democracy,"[8] so state Mr. Finn.

It is a good argument that if NCSS fights now against the present political agenda in Washington, social studies will be punished and NCSS may lose membership, visibility, prestige, and

whatever support it now has from outside sources. NCSS shall surely be painted by NCEST and sources from the highest official level in Washington as a reactionary professional group that is not willing to seek change. The NCSS has already endorsed the idea of a genuine accountability in education through state efforts to develop performance based assessment and has joined the effort to lobby Congress not to authorize funding of a national test or examination system. However, if there is national testing, the NCSS is willing to join that effort with the hope of changing the minds of NCEST members, encouraging them to expand the categories that include a world dimension and social studies subjects that would be tested beyond U.S. history and geography.

Unfortunately, it is too late, the reactionary reform agenda of America 2000 Goal 3 was already set even before the NCEST members were appointed. In fact, the political agenda was set in the late 1980s by avowed opponents who blamed social studies teachers and the field for the poor performance of students as measured by the 1986 assessment of student knowledge of American history. The train is on the track and already moving, the assumptions already made, a point of view already established. The Education Department's first major conference on history and civics in October, 1991, makes the point: 'Participants said they came away [from the conference] with the impression that the federal department favored social studies teaching that was. . history-focused, more traditional, and less multicultural. . .To a large extent, they said, the views echoed opinions already expressed on some of those topics by Diane S. Ravitch."[9]

It's a done deal, the only question now is time. When will the national tests become first voluntary and then mandatory? Minds are already made up, the agenda of Finn, Ravitch, and Crabtree is not going to change. Why should the critics' minds change? They have command of the federal treasury, Department of Education, and the support of the state governors and the President.

The concern about recognition and the fear of punishment is interesting. Social studies as a reform citizenship education movement has always been punished right from its early beginnings in the 20th century. The U.S. Department of Education has never had a staff social studies professional. What money has been granted for research and development at the national level for social studies has come essentially through the National Science Foundation and the social science disciplines. NDEA programs and New Social Studies projects of the 1960s and 70s, if they were described as social science projects, got funded.

Social studies as a reform and NCSS as an organization have never been in a powerful national leadership role but have always fought the Washington establishment and the professional organizations of the academic disciplines right from the beginning, 75 years ago. This is not to say that formal relationships between NCSS and professional associations do not

exist. However, remember social studies was created in particular to reform what history, civics and geography courses were teaching as citizenship education in the 19th century. If social studies were to disappear tomorrow, one would not find the professional history and social science organizations clamoring for its return. You cannot lose what you never had. Recognition of social studies as an important educational reform of citizenship education has never been granted by Washington, social science disciplines, or the humanities. Recognition cannot be taken away because the field never has received recognition.

Does the NCSS leadership have faith that the basic beliefs forming the social studies field are essential to citizenship education? Do they believe it would be temporarily expedient to moderate both beliefs and language to become a player on the political field, knowing that the beliefs of social studies will eventually prevail? Not to join efforts to test nationally only Euro-centric history and geography and thus to change social studies or perhaps eliminate it, is to leave NCSS where it is now, hopefully with social studies basic beliefs intact, a little bit of dignity, and sure knowledge that NCSS is not sleeping with a political enemy.

SUMMARY/CONCLUSION

In summary, America 2000 Goal 3, a reactionary reform of citizenship education, which stands for "our vision of America is one nation, indivisible--not splintered by language, or race or ethnic fragmentation,"[5] is finally at the door. This reactionary reform is a significant political challenge to the field and its professional organization, NCSS. Two alternative arguments were presented on how that challenge should be met. One position builds upon the assumption that the political agenda of Goal 3 and NCEST national testing can be modified. The NCSS proposes to cooperate with the reactionary reform, hoping that by working with Finn and Crabtree, attitudes can be tempered and interpretations broadened. A second position suggests that the political agenda is set, attitudes will not be flexible, and interpretations are already hardened. It would be ludicrous to join a political agenda that is dedicated to eradicating the field of social studies.

Both positions are built on hypotheses about what the suggested reform will actually mean in the classroom. There can be little question that action on school reform from Washington and from state capitals is going to affect all social studies teachers. The issues are complex. The right answers are not clear. Yet teachers are called upon to think as clearly as possible about the reform. America 2000 Goal 3 is at the door. It is a political challenge which can only effectively be met by a political response. Do you believe in citizenship education, do you believe in the integration of the social sciences and humanities for instructional purposes, do you believe that the proper content of social studies is the persistent and

contemporary problems and issues facing citizens? Do you believe that citizenship education requires the practice of problem solving and decision making throughout a social studies curriculum? Do you support the idea of a multicultural education and global studies? If teachers believe in these ideas, then they must either defend them or lose them. Teachers have a forced choice, they also have a voice. The question now is, Will they choose to use that voice?

NOTES

1. Chester E. Finn, Jr. The Social Studies Debacle, The American Spectator, May 1988, 15.

2. Report from the Board of Directors, The Social Studies Professional, September/October 1991,1.

3. National Council for the Social Studies Board of Directors, July 27-28, 1991, Motions, #30.

4. Margit McGuire. August 9, 1991 letter to members of NCEST.

5. Finn, 16.

6. Ibid.

7. Bill Emerson. Speech to supporters on Capitol Hill, Washington, September 17, 1991, as cited in the Journal and Courier, (Lafayette, Indiana) September 19, 1991, A4.

8. Finn, 15.

9. Debra Viadero, , "E.D.'s 1st Major History, Civics Conference Sparks Political Debate," Education Week, October 16, 1991, 5.

SOCIAL STUDIES: THERE IS A HISTORY, THERE IS A BODY, BUT IS IT WORTH SAVING?

James L. Barth
Purdue University

> Even as social studies has become a grab bag of current events . . . and opinion-mongering by uninformed children. . . it has not played a very large role in the education of young Americans. This field, in other words, is probably incapable of reforming itself.
>
> Chester E. Finn, Jr., 1988[1]

For approximately 75 years there has been a subject field called social studies. For 70 years there has been a professional organization called the National Council for Social Studies. So one could argue there is history, there is a body, but is there a consensus on basic ideas that support that body, that field? Educators have argued about the meaning of social studies since its inception.

NCSS's own Defining the Social Studies begins with, "The field of social studies is so caught up in ambiguity, inconsistency, and contradiction that it represents a complex educational enigma. . .. If the social studies is what the scholars in the field say it is, it is a schizophrenic bastard child."[2] The failure to arrive at a clear consensus about the agreed upon basic beliefs of social studies and the setting of standards has opened the field to critics who see a loose federation of so-called experts who simply do not understand, according to Finn, "What most parents and citizens expect them [students] to know."[3]

Chester Finn clearly makes the case, "The great dismal swamp of today's school curriculum is not reading or writing, not math or science, not even foreign language study. It is social studies, a field that has been getting slimier and more tangled ever since it changed its name from "history" around 1916.[4] Finn even though uninformed, continues, "Even as social studies has become a grab bag of current events, ersatz social science, one-worldism, and opinion-mongering by uninformed children and half-informed adults [social studies teachers], it has not played a very large role in the education of young Americans."[5]

Finn and other equally vocal critics have dismissed the social studies movement, their own version of the field, because they have found nothing to suggest a coherent set of beliefs. The critics actually do not attack ideas as much as they attack the notion of a grab bag perceiving social studies as flesh without bones, random ideas without coherence. They strike at social studies as they might at a bowl of jelly--all form with no

substance, an easy target to hit, a target that yet has no official definition and lacks an announced set of easily understood basic beliefs and no standards. Charlotte Crabtree, one of the vocal critics, is so confident that social studies is without standards that she has invited the NCSS to participate in the replacement of social studies in the school curriculum with a K-12 history standards in anticipation that national testing will follow those standards within two years.[6]

Social studies educators cannot safely dismiss Finn, Ravitch, perhaps Crabtree, the entire organization under the Department of Education, the political agenda of the present Washington Administration, and social studies' traditional critics from the social science and humanities disciplines for they command the attention of the public and they are backed by federal money, state governors, and President George Bush.

The present attack on social studies centers on the assumption that teachers lack a belief in democracy and that they are unwilling to meet the critics' set of standards. Many critics perceive the school as a church, the history book as the Bible, and the teacher as the indoctrinator of a "passion for democracy."[7] Those critics have clearly announced that they do not want to hear what they believe to be negative thoughts from social studies advocates. Those negative thoughts are such things as integration of the social sciences and humanities, global studies, multicultural education, diversity, and the name social studies. What they want to hear is U.S. history, geography, unity, democracy, internationalism, and the Euro-centric/American Way. Again Finn makes the point, "The social studies establishment remains enamored of process, problem solving, and globalism." And he concludes, "This field, in other words, is probably incapable of reforming itself."[8]

SOCIAL STUDIES IS THE 20TH CENTURY REFORM OF CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

And just why does Mr. Finn think social studies has no consistent core of beliefs, no standards? He just said it was grab bag, but why does he think social studies was created in the first place if, in fact, it has no substance? Possibly he believe social studies was created as a whim, or just the work of misguided academics? Perhaps a conspiracy? A Plot? Maybe even a subversion of the American Way which fits the critics' thoughts about John Dewey during the "red" scare in the 1920s. But whatever the reason, social studies, for Finn, has decreased citizens' passion for democracy.

Perhaps he does know that social studies was a product of the Progressive Era and assigns evil intent to the field because of this origin. Social studies was and is the reform of citizenship education as practiced before the turn of the century. One might suspect Finn's lament is that the 20th century citizenship education reform was unnecessary, and thus a return to a disciplined study of U.S. history and geography as

the major source of a school's formal citizenship program. Why be concerned about Finn's vision? The answer is clear, his vision is about to become reality when national standards are set in 1992 and national testing begins in 1993 over history and geography as proscribed in America 2000 Goal 3. In short, it is Finn's vision of citizenship education that will be tested.

THE NEW POLITICAL REFORM: AMERICA 2000 GOAL 3

And just what would Finn's reform of social studies as citizenship education be? First he would declare the past 75 years of social studies as a mistake and substitute a new political reform consistent with the present America 2000 Goal 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship. Goal 3: "By the year 2000, American students will leave Grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including. . . history and geography. . . that all students learn to use their minds well so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship."[9] That new reform would focus on a passion for democracy, a passion best served by teaching U.S. History and geography as separate disciplines.

The social studies as a reform movement is over, so say the critics, it did not work, the reform of some 75 years was never accepted by classroom teachers. What should replace social studies? The critics' answer is clear. It is time to return to a pre-social studies era, those 18th and 19th century days when citizens knew their history, their democracy and practiced unity and liberty. The argument continues, "the survival of democracy 'depends on our transmitting to each new generation the political vision of liberty and equality that unites us as Americans'."[10] Finn offers an insight into what would replace social studies, citizenship education is not so much a process of decision making but rather a "job of forging historically knowledgeable citizens with a passion for democracy."[11] In short, Finn believes that the proper content is not current contemporary issues and persistent problems in a global context but historical content within a western civilization context arranged in linear chronology to be nationally tested at the fourth, eighth, and twelfth grades. Thus the properly trained citizen is one who can recall and recite the key historical events and geographic locations selected for a national test.

Inculcating a passion for democracy, if not a passion for the Western world, is an old idea. Most cultures throughout the world transmit their beliefs and values on the grounds that a culture has a right to initiate its youth. Critics point out that if social studies was really citizenship education with the goal of forging a passion for democracy then seniors could identify the shape of the U.S. on a world map; college students could find Japan or the Middle East on a world map; eleventh graders would know how many senators were elected from each state, that Abraham Lincoln was President during the Civil War, and that selected Supreme Court decisions are important to know. In short, Finn's passion for democracy requires an historically

knowledgeable citizen, a citizen who can be educated if the school system would only concentrate on U.S. history and geography.

WHAT ARE BASIC BELIEFS?

There is a history, there is a body, but is social studies worth saving? The field is the 20th century educational reform of 19th century citizenship education. But is the field, as has been described, so caught up in ambiguity, inconsistency, and contradiction, that it has no basic beliefs? In short, what have the critics ignored or dismissed as fundamental to the development of social studies. There are at least four that have generally guided the development of social studies during the 20th century.

1. Social studies is citizenship education.
2. The social sciences and humanities concepts are interdisciplinarily integrated for instructional purposes.
3. The proper content of the social studies is persistent and contemporary social/personal conflicts, issues, and problems expressed as concepts, topics, and themes.
4. Citizenship education requires the practice of problem solving/decision making throughout a social studies curriculum.

If these are the basic beliefs, then a definition of social studies might be:

> **Social studies is the interdisciplinary integration of social science and humanities concepts for the purpose of practicing problem solving/decision making citizenship skills on critical social issues.**

The field must now find a consensus on beliefs and definition. Whether the beliefs and definition above are the generally accepted definition and beliefs of social studies is beside the point. This is an era of accountability, the critics of social studies are rapidly, under America 2000, Goal 3, setting standards that will be nationally tested. Can the field fail to respond to this challenge? Social studies standards must also be a part of the educational reform agenda; lacking those standards the field will become history.

IS SOCIAL STUDIES WORTH SAVING?

In conclusion, America 2000 Goal 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship, is the latest proposal on the reform of social studies. It is social studies, according to its critics that has condemned the nation for the past seven decades to mediocrity. Lack of knowledge about history, geography, and all of the other social sciences can be directly attributed to a lack of rigorous

and conscientious treatment in the nations' school classrooms. The critics maintain that teachers should support a Euro-centric perspective, democracy and the American way. Social studies, according to the critics, is the dismal swamp of education, a grab bag of diversity, globalism, and one-worldism that is incapable of reforming itself. Basic beliefs about social studies do not exist, social studies as a reform is a failure, it is time to try something new -- such a returning to the past where citizens were loyal to traditional political institutions and democracy.

Social studies educators, expressing an alternative view, know the basic beliefs were fashioned in the early years of the 20th century and reflect the progressive thought of that era. The new reform proposals under Goal 3 will significantly change the character of social studies, perhaps eliminating the field entirely. What should be the role as social studies teachers? Do they have faith in the beliefs that support the social studies field or should they trade that faith for a redefinition of citizenship education as history and geography? Do they believe that looking backward will push us forward into the 21st century? Do social studies teachers know what the field stands for, are they ready to identify basic beliefs, and do they want to set standards for citizenship education, or do they step aside allowing the critics to define those standards> Is social studies worth saving?

NOTES

1. Finn, Chester E. Jr. "The Social Studies Debacle," "Among the Educationaloids." The American Spectator, May 1988, 15-16.

2. Robert D. Barr, James L. Barth, S. Samuel Shermis. Defining the Social Studies, Bulletin 51. (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977), 1.

3. Finn, 15.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., 16.

6. Charlotte Crabtree, Director, National Center of History in the Schools. November 14, 1991, letter addressed to each member of the NCSS Board of Directors.

7. Finn, 16.

8. Ibid.

9. Indiana 2000: Indiana Progress Report, National Education Goals, Executive Summary, October 1991, 5.

10. Finn, 16.

11. Finn, 15.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF HILDA TABA TO SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION

Jack R. Fraenkel
San Francisco State University

In 1965, just after she had completed two studies in which she investigated the development and encouragement of student thinking in the elementary social studies curriculum,[1,2] Hilda Taba received a four-year grant from the U.S. Office of Education to develop a K-8 social studies curriculum. Located at San Francisco State University (SFSU),[3] the project was entitled, "The Development of a Comprehensive Social Studies Program for Grades K-8." The main task of the project staff (which I had recently joined),[4] was to develop a series of instructional guides for teachers in grades K-8 that would emphasize the development of student thinking about important social studies ideas.[5]

At that time in her life (she was in her early sixties), Hilda was a nationally recognized authority on curriculum development and design. Constantly in demand as a lecturer and consultant around the country, she was especially interested in social studies, and was a popular speaker at many local, state, and national professional meetings. A full Professor of Education at SFSU, she had taught earlier in her career at the University of Chicago, where she had also worked with Ralph Tyler on several research projects. She had been an Associate Dean for a period of time at SFSU, but found she preferred teaching and writing to administration, and hence had returned to the classroom.

The central ideas around which the project was focused were ones that Hilda had been advocating for quite some time, and reflected her basic philosophy about teaching.[6] They were the outgrowth of much of her lifelong work as a curriculum consultant to a number of school districts throughout the country (and abroad), as well as to a variety of other institutions, agencies, and organizations. Many of these ideas were quite unique for their time, and although they were not necessarily original with Hilda (many of the leading curriculum theorists of the 1960s--and and earlier--propagated ideas similar to those of Hilda), Taba certainly was one of the leaders who had been arguing throughout the '50s and '60s for a new approach to curriculum and teaching. She also was one of the leading figures in the new social studies movement which came to its fruition in the 1960s.

Hilda was an original thinker par excellence! She had a superb memory and a tremendous capacity for recall. Not always easy to understand, or finding it easy to say exactly what she intended (partly because English was not her first language),[7] her ideas were not the simplest to grasp when she first expressed them. A continued study of them, however, was well worth the

effort.

Many of Hilda's ideas had a considerable impact on social studies educators. Certainly my own professional development was strongly influenced by the opportunity I had to work with Hilda in the early stages of my career. In the remainder of this paper, therefore, I would like to describe briefly a few of the more influential of these ideas, since I think that they are as relevant today as they were in 1967 at the time of Hilda's death.[8] Space limitations prevent as thorough a discussion as I would like, but I shall try to provide enough description to capture the essence of what Hilda had in mind.[9]

THE IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING MULTIPLE OBJECTIVES

Objectives are important for any curriculum developer or teacher to keep in mind. They establish a sense of purpose, and provide a basis for deciding what to include, exclude, and emphasize. But it is important, said Hilda, whether one is trying to build a total curriculum, prepare an instructional unit, or even write a daily lesson plan, to keep in mind the necessity for developing multiple objectives. Helping students to acquire information, for example, is important, but it is never enough. Teachers and curriculum workers also need to think about the development of important ideas, the development of thinking skills, the formation of attitudes and values, and the development of academic and social skills. This is, of course, by no means an easy task. But it must be undertaken if one wishes to help students develop to the fullest all of their capacities and talents.

BREAKING DOWN THE ORGANIZATION OF SUBJECT MATTER INTO THREE LEVELS

Hilda argued repeatedly that there were three distinct levels of knowledge to be included and developed in a curriculum, and that each had to be treated differently by curriculum developers. Accordingly, in the Taba curriculum,[10] three blocks of knowledge--**key concepts, organizing ideas, and specific facts**--were organized in a manner that departed considerably from more traditional arrangements.

Key concepts are words that represent highly abstract generalizations. Examples used in the project materials included (among others) the ideas of **cultural change, interdependence, power, cooperation, conflict** and **causality**. These key concepts were selected for their power (i.e., their capacity) to organize and synthesize large amounts of information (i.e. specific facts). Because of their power, such concepts can be developed in an increasingly more complex and abstract manner throughout a curriculum, and can be illustrated at different levels of abstraction, complexity and generality. The understanding of these key concepts that students gain in one grade can then be built on and developed in successive grades. For example, the concept of **interdependence** can be illustrated in the first grade

by teachers discussing the interdependence that exists among the members of the students' families; in the fourth grade by teachers discussing the interdependence that exists among workers in various industries and occupations; in the seventh grade by teachers discussing the interdependence that exists among nations as they interact with one another on the world scene. and so on. It should be noted that key concepts are not to be taught to students directly (i.e., by giving them a formal definition of the concept), but rather illustrated over and over again through a variety of factual examples that are appropriate to the students' age and grade level.

Such concepts suggest not only organizing ideas which can serve as a focus around which instructional units can be developed, but they also suggest key questions to ask about such ideas. These key questions in turn help to identify the dimensions of the idea that need to be investigated and suggest what facts to use as examples to illustrate and support the organizing ideas.

Organizing ideas represent important "connections" that hopefully students will understand after their completion of a unit of study. They are the "organizing" focus of an instructional unit. They also are generalizations, usually although not necessarily) less abstract than the key concepts. An example, suggested by the concept of **societal control**, is the following statement: **"To maintain themselves, all societies regulate the actions of their members through some system of laws and customs.** Another example, suggested by the concept of **culture**, is the statement: **"In order to preserve their culture, all societies try to inculcate their young into the prevailing way of life."**

Organizing ideas are to be viewed more as hypotheses than as certainties, however. They offer insights into the relationships that appear to exist in the world. Hilda argued that when students begin to understand the relationships that the organizing ideas suggest, and when they can support an idea with factual illustrations, they have acquired usable knowledge that will stand them in good stead far longer than will the acquisition of a host of unrelated facts.

Organizing ideas can be repeated at several grade levels, but they should be expressed somewhat differently each time. As students are exposed to (or find), through their reading (or in other ways), examples of specific facts that illustrate a particular organizing idea and begin to think about it, they probably will not express the idea exactly as it has been written by a curriculum developer; in fact, it is probably more desirable that students express these ideas in their own words. Hilda continually reminded us, as we prepared the instructional units, that we should view organizing ideas (and urge teachers to view them) as "working hypotheses" rather than as truths to be confirmed. She stressed that teachers should want students to understand and use these ideas, but they should never insist that

they do.

What criteria should curriculum developers use to select organizing ideas? Five were viewed by us on the project as especially important:

*significance--does the idea represent an important relationship about some aspects(s) of the world in which human beings live?

*explanatory power--will the idea help students to understand and explain important issues and problems that confront people in today's world?

*appropriateness--is the idea suited to the needs, interests, and maturity of students?

*durability--is the idea one of lasting importance?

*balance--will the idea promote a breadth and depth of understanding of events, individuals, actions, or occurrences?

Once an organizing idea has been chosen as a focus for study, teachers can select a variety of specific facts to illustrate and develop the idea. It should be noted that for any particular organizing idea, any one of a number of facts can be selected for study with equal justification. For example, as illustrations of the organizing idea that "to maintain themselves, all societies regulate the actions of their members through some system of laws and customs," ancient Mesopotamia, France during the days of Louis XIV, or contemporary San Francisco could be selected for study as specific examples of the idea. It is important to choose a number of contrasting facts (note that the teacher by no means has to be the chooser of the facts' to be studied; students certainly can suggest examples themselves) because students come to understand more thoroughly the number and complexity of the relationships that a powerful idea represents when they are confronted with a variety of facts that illustrate that idea.

How does a teacher or curriculum developer decide what subject matter to study? The following criteria were used by the project staff in their preparation of the instructional units:

1. How fundamental is the subject matter to be studied?

*Does it reflect the most up-to-date knowledge available?

*Does it reflect essential, basic knowledge that has wide application?

*Does it offer important insights to help students gain an understanding of themselves and their world?

*Does it promote a spirit of inquiry?

2. Is the subject matter socially and culturally significant?

*Is it consistent with the realities of today's world?

*Does it examine values and value-conflicts?

*Does it promote an understanding of the phenomenon of change and the problems which change produces? Does it develop minds that can cope with change?

3. Does the subject matter relate to the needs, interests, and developmental level of students?

*Can it be learned by the students--is it in keeping with the abilities of the students involved?

4. Does the subject matter promote breadth and depth of understanding?

*Does it develop the capacity to apply what is learned in one situation to a new and different situation?

SAMPLE RATHER THAN COVER

Hilda continually would say: "You can't cover everything! No matter how many details you know about something, or want to teach to children, there always will be another detail to be learned or, if learned, that you won't remember." "Coverage, she would say, "is an impossibility." No teacher can cover everything. It was futile, she thought, even to contemplate trying to cover "all of the facts," since this simply couldn't be done.

Specific facts become obsolete very rapidly. The name of the individual who is President of the United States, for example, will change about every eight (or sometimes four) years. The percentage of a given country's oil exports will change from month to month. The temperature in any of a number of cities throughout the world will change daily.

Since it is impossible to teach all the facts about anything, therefore, only certain facts can be taught. What facts should a teacher (or curriculum developer) select for students to study? That depends. It depends on the more important idea(s) one wants to develop. Those facts should be selected that will enhance understanding of the idea. Since several different samplings of facts can be used equally well to promote understanding of an idea, there is no single set of selected facts that must be studied by all students. Alternative data sets, in fact, can be studied by different students or by the same students at different times. Much will depend on the kinds of materials (e.g., texts, filmstrips, films, paperbacks,

etc.) that are available, the kinds of students involved, the nature of the subject matter the teacher knows a lot about or likes to teach, and the contrasting illustrations the subject matter can provide.

This notion of contrast is important. Students are more likely to obtain a clearer understanding of an important idea through a detailed study in depth of two or perhaps three contrasting samples than they will from a more inclusive, but necessarily limited, study of several samples.

"For example, in teaching American history in the fifth grade, the (organizing) idea might be that the way of life in the (original thirteen) colonies was influenced by two factors: (1) who the settlers were and what they brought with them (ideas, beliefs, skills, tastes, etc.); and (2) whether or not the characteristics of their landing place (People, climate, soil, etc.) were hospitable. It is possible that students can learn more about this aspect of colonial life by a detailed study of two contrasting colonies than by a rapid and superficial study of all thirteen colonies. This does not imply that the other eleven colonies will not be mentioned, but, rather, that the important ideas about colonization will best be conveyed through limited depth studies."[11]

In short, facts should be sampled rather than covered. There are far too many facts in the world for anyone to learn all of them in their lifetime. As a result, teachers (and curriculum developers) have no choice but to select certain facts to study. The important question (Hilda would stress) is not **how many** facts, but **which** facts we want students to think about.

ORGANIZING ;EARNING ACTIVITIES AROUND CONCEPTS AND IDEAS

Proceeding simultaneously with content selection and structuring was the selection and organization of **learning activities**. Learning activities were an important part of the Taba curriculum. They constituted the things students did during their daily work in and sometimes outside of) the classroom. Watching films, listening to tapes, working in small groups, discussion ideas, taking notes, preparing summaries, analyzing case studies--all are examples of the many different kinds of activities that were included in the instructional guides.

Hilda believed that learning activities should be more than mere "busy work." Every activity should always be designed with a definite purpose in mind, one that was related to helping students understand the organizing idea around which an instructional unit was organized. Furthermore, she felt that different kinds of activities were needed to promote different objectives. Teachers (and curriculum developers) should not assume than an activity designed to help students understand a particular subject matter, for example, automatically would help them acquire a desired skill, or promote a certain attitude toward learning. Activities to promote such "non-content-

focused" objectives had to be planned for and appropriately designed. If possible, of course, activities should be designed that would contribute to the attainment of multiple objectives (e.g., an activity designed to encourage the mastery of content might also promote the development of a skill).

LEARNING ACTIVITIES SHOULD BUILD ON WHAT HAS BEEN LEARNED BEFORE

Hilda was convinced that not all students learned things in the same way. She stressed continually, therefore, that teachers had to think up different kinds of learning activities if they truly wanted to help all students learn. She felt that in too many classrooms students were engaged in the same kind of activity every day--mostly listening to teachers talk, reading (or listening to teachers read), or writing (often filling in a worksheet of one sort or another.) More--much more--variety, however, was needed. As she put it, "different students learn in different ways."

Many students do not learn well at all via talk and the printed word. They need to be more directly or actively involved. It is for this reason that activities such as field trips, role-playing, sociodramas, committee work, drawing, painting, dancing, taking photographs, making maps, working in the community--in short, any and all activities that involve **doing** things as well as **receiving** information, are so important for students to experience.

The concept of an inductively organized **learning activity sequence** is important to understand her, since such sequences were an integral part of the instructional units and the idea of sequencing was a basic part of Hilda's philosophy of learning. In brief, learning activities fell into four (not mutually exclusive) categories: **intake** activities, the completion of which requires students to take in information in some way (e.g., activities like reading, observing, listening, etc.); **organizing** activities, which help students to organize the information they have acquired (e.g., activities like outlining, charting, summarizing, paraphrasing, mapping, graphing, etc.); **demonstrative** activities, which ask students to use the information they have organized (e.g., activities like role-playing, reporting, explaining, generalizing, giving analogies, etc.); and **creative** activities, which ask students to utilize the information they have absorbed in a new way (e.g., activities like solving problems, writing essays, forming questions, hypothesizing, predicting, etc.).[12] Taken together, all four types of activities organized inductively, made up what were known as learning activity sequences.

Here is an example of a learning activity sequence designed for first graders:

Concept: Self-identity

Objective: Children will identify voices of their

classmates and themselves, speaking on a tape recorder.

Instructional sequence:

1. Introduce the tape recorder to the children. Show how it operates. Talk into the microphone and record your voice, then play back the recording for the children (intake activity-observing, listening).

2. Let each child record into the tape recorder by first making body sounds--clapping, stomping, whistling. Play back the recording to children (organizational and demonstrative activities--making own sounds).

3. Let each child hold the microphone and say his or her name into the tape recorder. Play back the recording immediately (demonstrative activity--speaking into the recorder).

4. Point out that there are no "right" or "wrong" voices. Point out the similarities and differences in the students' voices. Emphasize the fact that each person has a unique voice (intake activity--listening).

5. Replay the tape and have the children point out some similarities and differences in the tone or sound of each other's voices. Record the differences by making a line graph. Using a piece of paper and crayon, have the children draw in one continuous line, making the line go up if the voice is high and down if the voice is low (organizational activity--charting).

6. Let each child make up a story and record it on the tape without using their name. Play back the tape and use these stories to test the children's voice recognition (demonstrative and creative activities-story development and telling).[13]

At this point, I want to interject a personal note. When I first began work on the seventh grade instructional guide for the project materials, I experienced considerable difficulty in learning how to write a decent learning activity sequence. After a particularly wearying day of getting seemingly nowhere, I expressed my frustration to Hilda. She asked me to try and describe why I was having such trouble, and I said I thought it was because I wasn't really sure what it meant to try to teach something inductively.

"What are you working on currently?," she asked.

"I'm trying to work up a comparison of the values inherent in the city-states of Athens and Sparta," I replied.

"How?," asked Hilda.

"By describing and comparing various characteristics of each city-state--family life, social strata, military life, customs, religious preferences, recreational pursuits, etc. I'm thinking

of making a master chart which would present all of this information to the students in a clearly organized way."

"Who is doing the organizing?," she asked.

"I am."

"Aha," she replied, "Could the students do it?"

"Do what?"

"Do the organizing! Sounds like you, and eventually the teacher, are doing all the work. You're giving them a lot of information, but how are you helping them to digest it--to make sense out of it?"

"I'm guess I'm not," I replied. "Can you elaborate on how to do this?"

"Well, could you give the students some information to read or see or listen to about Athens and Sparta, but have them figure out what to do with it? The important thing for you to think about is not how to present the information to the students. There aren't too many ways to present information--text material, movies, filmstrips, recordings, lecture--whatever is the most interesting way for the particular material you're using. Your job is to figure out and design activities that teachers can use to help students to think for themselves, to do the organizing or whatever they need to do to make sense out of the information their teachers ask them to read, listen to, watch, etc.

"But don't they need information?"

"You bet," said Hilda. "Teachers need to provide students with interesting, relevant, and important information, to be sure. If the students perceive it as interesting and important, they will want to learn it. But the main job for a curriculum developer who wants to get students to do the thinking, as we do, is not to give this meaning to the students directly, but to design activities that allow, encourage and help students to make sense--their own sense--of the information they come across, whatever the source. Any ideas here?"

'I think I see," I said. "Perhaps they could hold a discussion among themselves about how to organize the data they will be getting. They might want to put it into a chart, but they also might think of another, possibly better way to organize the information. Perhaps I could have them engage in some role-playing of Greek and Roman citizens discussing the differences between their two city-states. To be able to do this, they would need to find out what life in the city-states was like. Perhaps they could be investigative reporters for a newspaper of the time describing life in the city-state in which they do not live. Maybe they could be "Information specialists," briefing their fellow "citizens" about what life is like in the

other city-state, and comparing it with their own. Perhaps artistically-inclined students could illustrate the similarities and differences between Athens and Sparta. Perhaps. . ."

"Good! You've got the idea," said Hilda. 'Just remember, we want teachers to get students to do the organizing, the questioning, the summarizing, the analyzing, etc. Our guides should reflect this. They should not require, request, or instruct teachers to do these things for students."

There were two important things that we had to remember in writing these sequences: (a) never have one intake activity followed by another; and (b) include as much variety as possible in the sorts of activities that were included. Variety was a characteristic that all effective learning sequences had to possess. Nothing, said Hilda, was more detrimental to learning than for an unimaginative teacher to require students to engage in the same activity day after day, no matter how exciting that activity might have been for students initially.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF INDUCTIVE TEACHING STRATEGIES

I think that Hilda was the first to advocate the development and use of inductively organized **teaching strategies**. So far as she was concerned, teaching strategies performed the equivalent task for teachers that learning activities performed for students. They were to indicate the actual procedures that a teacher would use in order to implement certain desired objectives.

Prior to receiving the K-8 curriculum grant, Hilda had developed three such inductive strategies (**developing concepts, inferring and generalizing, applying generalizations**) that were designed to enhance student thinking.[14] After her death, the project staff developed four additional strategies, one in the cognitive domain (**attaining concepts**),[15] **and three in the affective domain** (exploring feelings, interpersonal problem solving, and analyzing values)[16] Each of these strategies involved a series of basic questions that teachers were to ask in a given, specified order, and suggested the sorts of responses they could expect from students as they answered these questions.

In the strategy entitled **inferring and generalizing**, for example, students are asked to make inferences and generalizations about relationships among various kinds of data. In the strategy entitled **applying generalizations**, students are asked to apply previously learned generalizations and facts to predict what might logically occur in new situations. In the strategy entitled **attaining concepts**, students are presented with a wide variety of examples and non-examples of a concept and asked to differentiate between the two.

In the strategy entitled **exploring feelings**, students are asked to make inferences about how people feel in an emotional situation and explain why they think they feel that way or ways).

In the strategy entitled **interpersonal problem solving**, students are asked to propose and evaluate solutions to a problem involving a conflict among persons or groups of people. In the strategy entitled **analyzing values**, students are asked to make inferences about the values that underlie people's actions.

Perhaps the best known, and certainly the most widely cited of the strategies, was that of **Developing Concepts**. It is reproduced in its entirety in Table 1.[17]

Table 1
DEVELOPING CONCEPTS

(Listing, Grouping, and Labeling)

This task requires students to group a number of items on some kind of basis. The teaching strategy consists of asking students the following questions, usually in this order.

teacher Asks:	Student responds:	Teacher follow through:
What do you see (Notice, find, etc.)?	Gives items	Makes sure items are accessible to each student (on blackboard transparency, etc.
Do any of these items seem to belong together?	Finds some similarities as a basis for grouping items	Communicates the grouping that has occurred (e.g., by underlining in colored chalk, or marking with symbols, etc.)
Why would you group these items together?*	Identifies and verbalizes the common characteristics of the items in a group.	Seeks clarification of responses if and when necessary
What would you call these groups that you have formed?	Verbalizes a label (often more than one word) that appropriately encompasses all the items in a group.	Records the label
Could these items belong in more than one group?	States different grouping possibilities	Records the new or revised groupings

Table 1 (continued)

Can we put these same items in different groups?# Why would you group them that way?	States additional different groupings	Records new groupings
Can someone say in one sentence something about all these groups?P	Offers a suitable summary sentence	Reminds students, if necessary, to take into consideration all the groups before them

"Sometimes you ask the same student "why" when he or she offers a grouping, and others times you may wish to get many groups before considering why things are grouped together.

Although this step is important because it encourages flexibility, it will not be appropriate on all occasions.

P This step is often omitted because as a generalizing activity it may be reserved for the strategy of inferring and generalizing.

Each one of the steps in the strategy shown in Table 1 is a necessary prerequisite to the ones that follow. This is true for all of the teaching strategies that Hilda and the project staff developed, and is a basic characteristic of their structure. It should not be interpreted to mean, however, that teachers must follow a uniform pace in implementing this (or any other) strategy. The pace a teacher employs should always depend on the students being taught and how experienced they are with the strategy. The crucial thing is that the students, not the teacher, perform the activity (e.g., in this case the grouping and labeling) called for in the strategy.

Each one of the steps in the strategy shown in Table 1 is a necessary prerequisite to the ones that follow. This is true for all of the teaching strategies that Hilda and the project staff developed, and is a basic characteristic of their structure. It should not be interpreted to mean, however, that teachers must follow a uniform pace in implementing this (or any other) strategy. The pace a teacher employs should always depend on the students being taught and how experienced they are with the strategy. The crucial thing is that the students, not the teacher, perform the activity (e.g., in this case the grouping and labeling) called for in the strategy.

"It is important that the students perform the operations for themselves, see the relationships between items in their own way, figure out a basis on which to group items, and devise the categories or labels for the groups. The teacher should not do any of these things for them, although on rare occasion she (or he) might, if other methods fail, offer an alternative way of grouping items. The important thing to aim for is a climate in which the teacher's suggestion is given no more status than that of the students; but is simply offered as another alternative to be considered."[18]

The questions in the strategy shown in Table 1, as well as all of the other strategies the project developed, were designed as guides for teachers concerning how to proceed, not a set of inquiries for them to answer. Hilda believed strongly that all of the cognitive and affective strategies were **generic** strategies, that is, they could be used with any kind of subject matter and any type of student, regardless of the student's ability level.

EMPHASIZE THINKING

Throughout her professional life, Hilda was extremely interested in helping students to understand and use knowledge rather than just to remember it. Accordingly, she wanted teachers to help students to think about facts and their significance rather than merely asking them to recall them. Part of her desire in this regard led her to design the three inductive strategies to enhance student thinking that I mentioned earlier. Her major objective in developing these strategies was to present teachers with a set of procedures they could use on a regular basis to encourage students to think. Mastery of the strategies, she often said, would give teachers a vehicle they could use with all kinds of students, from the most academically able to those less so. It is worthy of note that Hilda believed all students, not just the academically talented (i.e., the very bright or "gifted"), were capable of high level thinking. In fact, she often would provide us with examples of a thoughtful comment that had come from a student who previously had been labeled as "below average."

Hilda loved good questions--that is, questions that asked students to do something with data--to look for "a different way to say that" (e.g., when they were engaged in trying to group items together to form concepts); to look for relationships; to seek our similarities and differences; to explain; to compare; to analyze; to generalize. She continually stressed to everyone with whom she came in contact that **all** children could think, and that the job of everyone who worked in schools was to provide them with the skills they needed to do just that.

AN EMPHASIS ON PEOPLE

Above all, Hilda felt that the social studies should be about people--what people were like, how they were similar and

different, what they had accomplished, their problems, their customs, their ways of life, their culture. It was because of this belief that Hilda felt that the discipline of anthropology was so important for curriculum developers to consider as they went about building a social studies curriculum. Insights and concepts from anthropology, she thought, should be explored at all grade levels. Accordingly, the concept of **cultural change** was introduced in the first grade units by having students discuss changes that take place over time in the composition of families, and then developed further in the second grade by having students compare the changes that occur in the kinds of jobs people do, followed by, in the third grade, having students consider the ways that people in different cultures meet their needs and how these ways change over time; and so forth. Throughout all of the instructional units, the activities of people in different cultures were compared and contrasted.

For example, third graders were asked to compare life in their own culture with life in an Eskimo culture. They first were presented with a variety of facts about Eskimo life (daily activities, method of hunting, recreation, family interaction, etc.) using stories, films, and filmstrips. They then were engaged in activities that helped them to understand the facts they had acquired. Other activities were planned to help students learn some facts about their own culture. At various pints they were encouraged to make (or revise) generalizations about Eskimo culture, about their own culture, and then, eventually, to formulate a (hopefully) more synthetic generalization that would apply to both their own and Eskimo culture.

Anthropological ideas seemed especially important for students to study for a number of reasons:

*they would serve as a counter to ethnocentrism in students;

*they would help students to understand the effects that cultural factors have on people;

*they would help students to realize the differences in values that exist both within and between societies;

*they would help students to perceive not only the differences, but also the similarities among the peoples of the world;

*they would help students to realize how changes in one part of a society bring about changes in other parts of the society.

Finally let me present an example of teacher-student dialogue taken from a taped recording of a classroom discussion in which a teacher, trained by Hilda and the project staff, was attempting to get students to reason about the relationships that exist between a people and their culture. The dialogue that follows involved a third grade class that had been studying the

Zulu as an example of a tribal society in Africa. The teacher was trying to help the class realize that ideas come from people, not simply out of thin air. Approximately 30 minutes of discussion about change in a tribal society had preceded the following exchange.

As a result of this discussion, the teacher had listed the following things on the board:

Changes	People Who Brought Change
Metal tools	Peace Corps
Metal pans	Missionaries
Medicine	Traders
Nurses	Travelers
Schools	World Health Organization
Books	Soldiers
Bicycles	
Bigger buildings	

The following interchange then took place:

Teacher: Do you think these people would have discovered these things all by themselves someday without the help of all these other groups for teachers?

Student #1: No

Teacher: What do you think--how would it be? If these people hadn't come to them?

Student #1: Well, they would still be living in their old ways--for instance, their houses--until they just get so old, centuries and centuries. And maybe someday they'd find out about these ways and these things.

Student #2: Maybe they would find out about our ideas--like if one African moved to America and traveled around and then came back to his village and traveled all around and spread the idea and told them. Maybe some would not believe it.

Teacher: How could this person help them to believe what he saw?

Student #2: Tell them, or take a picture of something.

Student #1: Or he could do it himself and start building that kind of building.

Teacher: Start building better buildings after what--after what he had seen?

Student #1: IF he wanted to, he could show then how they did it.

Student #3: Some people would not believe it unless they went over there, because almost all people believe that they already have everything. I mean, if the African came back and told the people, they probably would not believe it.

Student #4: Yes, they would get these things, because they would finally learn. If they could not learn what we have here, how did they learn what they already are doing?

Teacher: Say that once more.

Student #4: If they can't learn what we learn here, how could they learn what they already had learned there?[19]

The important thing to realize about the above interaction is that it represents an attempt by a teacher not only to help students become aware of an important (anthropological) insight (previously thought about and conceptualized as the focus for an instruction unit), but also to help them gain an understanding of a key concept from anthropology without telling them directly what the concept is.

Many of Hilda's ideas, especially the ones I have described in this article, had a considerable influence during the 1960s and 1970s on inquiry-oriented social studies teachers. The focus on multiple objectives, the 'spiral" curriculum, the emphasis on thinking, the use of inductively organized teaching strategies, the development of teaching-learning units organized around concepts and ideas, and the sequencing of learning activities are as important today as they were 25 years ago when they first began to be talked about. It is a rare meeting of ASCD or of AACTE (or of NCSS, for that matter) that her name does not surface when the talk turns to matters of curriculum design; of "big ideas;" of "teaching strategies," or of "teaching students to think." There is no doubt in my mind that Hilda was one of the major figures in the field of curriculum (one might also say in the field of social studies education as well) during the twentieth century.

All of us who were on the project staff (and many others, I believe) consider it a privilege to have worked with Hilda. We miss her. We miss those wonderful staff meetings every week where ideas flourished, and where discussion and debate flowed fast and furious. We miss her ideas, her warmth, her encouragement, and her example. As for me, much of what I learned from Hilda--about teaching, about learning, about curriculum development, about people--I have tried to incorporate in my own writings and talks with teachers and students. She represented, for me, the best that teaching has to offer.

Endnotes

[1]Hilda Taba, Samuel Levine, & Freeman F. Elzey. (1964, April). **Thinking in elementary school children.** San Francisco, CA: San Francisco STate College. (Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Final Report, Cooperative Research Project No. 1574).

[2]Hilda Taba. (1966, February). **Teaching strategies and cognitive functioning in elementary school children.** San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State College (Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Final Report, Cooperative Research Project No. 2404).

[3]At that time, San Francisco State College.

[4]In June of 1966, just after I had graduated from Stanford University with a Ph.D. in education (with a specialization in social studies education), Hilda had hired me to work as a research associate on the project. In September, I joined the project staff, at the same time being given a joint appointment as an Associate Professor in both education and social studies.

[5]See Jack R. Fraenkel. (1969) A curriculum model for the social studies. **Social Education** 33(1), pp. 41-47.

[6]For a more complete discussion of Hilda's philosophy as well as her ideas about curriculum, see her 1962 text, which has achieved somewhat the status of a modern classic: Hilda Taba. (1962). **Curriculum development: Theory and practice** New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

[7]Hilda was born in Estonia in 1902 and received a her Bachelor's degree from the University of Tartu in 1926. She first came to the United States in 1926 as a European Fellow to Bryn Mawr College, where she received a Master's Degree. After receiving a Ph.D. from Columbia University, she returned to Estonia in 1930. Returning to the United States in 1933, she taught at several universities before she came to San Francisco State in 1951.

[8]Taba's work continues to be referred to in the social studies literature. For example, see Walter C. Parker. (1991). Achieving thinking and decision-making objectives on social studies. In James P. Shaver, (ed.). **Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning** (pp. 345-356). New York: Macmillan.

[9]For more information and examples, the interested reader should consult, in addition to the references cited above, any or all of the following sources: Hilda Taba &I Enoch I. Sawin. (19612). A proposed model for evaluation. **Educational Leadership 20(1), pp. 1-7**; Hilda Taba. (1963). Learning by discovery: Psychological end educational rationale. **The Elementary School Journal, 63**, pp. 308-316; Hilda Taba & Freeman Elzey (1964).

Teaching strategies and thought processes. **TEachers College Record, 65**, pp. 524-534; Hilda Taba. (1967). Implementing thinking as an objective in social studies. In Jean Fair & Fannie R. Shaftel (Eds.). **Effective thinking in the social studies**, 37th yearbook (pp. 25-49). Wash;Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies; Jack R. Fraenkel (1968). Building anthropological content into elementary school social studies. **Social Education 32(1)**, pp. 251-254; Jack R. Fraenkel, Anthony H. McNaughton, Norman E. Wallen, & Mary C. Durkin. (1969). Improving elementary-school social studies: An idea-oriented approach. **The Elementary School Journal, 70(3)**, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press; Hilda Taba, Mary Durkin, Jack R. Fraenkel, & Anthony H. McNaughton. (1971) **A teachers' handbook to elementary social studies: An inductive approach** (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley; Jack R. Fraenkel. (1980). **Helping students think and value: Strategies for teaching the social studies.** (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

[10]Hilda died in 1967, two years before the work of the project was completed. The project staff, in her honor, renamed the project "The Taba Curriculum Development Project." For a complete description of the work of the project, see Norman E. Wallen, Mary C. Durkin, Jack R. Fraenkel, Anthony J. McNaughton & Enoch I. Sawin. (1969). **Development of a comprehensive curriculum model for social studies for grades one through eight, inclusive of procedures for implementation and dissemination.** San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State College (Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Final Report, Project No.5-1314, Grant No. OE-6-10-182).

[11]Taba, Durkin, Fraenkel, & McNaughton, **op.cit.**, p. 31.

[12]Fraenkel, **op.cit.**pp. 131-136.

[13]**Ibid.**, pp. 135-136.

[14]For a detailed discussion of the strategies that were developed, refer to the final report of the project, **opcit.**

[15]Taba, Durkin, Fraenkel, & McNaughton, **op.cit.**, p. 71.

[16]See the final report of the project, **op.cit.**, p. 25-29.

[17]Taba, Durkin, Fraenkel, & McNaughton, **op.cit.**, p. 67.

[18]**Ibid.**, p. 69.

[19]Fraenkel, Building anthropological content into elementary school social studies, **op.cit.**, pp. 253-260.

References

Fraenkel, Jack R. "Building anthropological content into elementary school social studies." **Social Education 32** (October, 1968): 251-254.

Fraenkel, Jack R. "A curriculum model for the social studies." **Social Education 33** (January, 1969): 41-47.

Fraenkel, Jack R. **Helping students think and value: Strategies for teaching the social studies.** (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1980.

Fraenkel, Jack R., Anthony H. McNaughton, Norman E. Wallen, and Mary C. Durkin. "Improving elementary-school studies: An idea-oriented approach." **The Elementary School Journal** 70 (March, 1969): 154-163.

Parker, Walter C. "Achieving thinking and decision-making objectives in social studies." In **Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning** ed. James P. Shaver, 345-356. New York: Macmillan, 1991.

Taba, Hilda. **Curriculum development: Theory and practice.** New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.

Taba, Hilda. "Learning by discovery: Psychological end educational rationale." **The Elementary School Journal**, 63 (March, 1963): 308-316.

Taba, Hilda, **Teaching strategies and cognitive functioning in elementary school children.** Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Final Report, Cooperative Research Project NO. 2404, San Francisco State College, FEbruary, 1966.

Taba, Hilda. "Implementing thinking as an objective in social studies." In **Effective thinking in the social studies,** 37th yearbook. eds. Jean Fair and Fannie R. Shaftel, 25-49. Washington DC: National Council for the Social Studies, 1967.

Taba, Hilda. Mary C. Durkin, Jack R. Fraenkel, and Anthony H. McNaughton. **A teachers' handbook to elementary social studies: An inductive approach** (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1971.

Taba, Hilda, and Freeman Elzey. "Teaching strategies and thought processes." **Teachers College Record** 65 (February, 1964): 524-534.

Taba, Hilda, Samuel Levine, and Freeman Elzey. **Thinking in elementary school children.** Washington DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Final Report, Cooperative Research Project No. 1574, San Francisco State College, April, 1964.

Taba, Hilda, and Enoch I. Sawin. "A proposed model in evaluation." **Educational Leadership** 20 (October, 1962): 1-7.

Wallen, N. E., Mary C. Durkin, Jack R. Fraenkel, Anthony H. McNaughton, and Enoch I. Sawin. (1969, October). **Development of a comprehensive curriculum model for social studies for grades one through eight, inclusive of procedures for implementation and dissemination.** Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Final Report, Project NO. 5-1314, Grant NO. OE-6-10-182, San Francisco State College, October, 1969.